Ātharvaṇá

(a collection of essays on the AtharvaVeda
with special reference to its Paippalāda tradition)

अ[ा]थर्वणाभिधो वेदो धवलो मर्कटाननः।
अक्षमालान्वितो वामे दक्षे कुम्भधरः स्मृतः॥

Edited by

Abhijit Ghosh

A Sanskrit Book Depot Publication

Ātharvaṇá

(a collection of essays on the AtharvaVeda
with special reference to its Paippalāda tradition)

Edited by
Abhijit Ghosh

Sanskrit Book Depot
Kolkata: 700 006 (India)
2002

Publisher
Abhoy Barman
Sanskrit Book Depot
28/1 Bidhan Sarani
Kolkata: 700 006 (India)

First published: June, 2002
© Editor

Laser composer
Sanatan Karak
Laxmi Computer Centre
47/2A Badridas Temple Street
Kolkata: 700 006 (India)

Printer
C.S. Studio
1/R Chhatu Babu Lane
Kolkata: 700 014 (India)

Price Rs. 375, $ 25, € 25

In hallowed memory of
Professor Durgamohan Bhattacharyya

Editorial

As editor, I shall be happy if this Volume can contribute, by the least, to the ongoing international effort of making available a reliable and critical edition cum translation of an ancient and highly important Vedic text, the PaippalādaSaṃhitā, on the basis of a careful study of the history and present state of the (oral and written) transmission of which, and with the help of modern techniques, well-qualified scholars from various universities (i.a. Harvard, Oxford, Zürich, Sapporo, Jadavpur, and most importantly Leiden) are working on portions of the text.

It may be found, I must with some regret admit, that several of the contributions to this Volume do not reflect adequate cognizance of the position of the art of international AtharvaVeda studies sketched in my introductory article on the importance of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā and the present state of Paippalāda studies, particularly the recent advances in our knowledge about the AtharvaVeda (Paippalāda). But, as an Atharvavividiṣant, a friend and colleague of the contributors, I tried to include in this Volume widest possible range of views generated by AtharvaVeda-related research by the international community of scholars. However, I am here equally duty-bound to confess that the views expressed by the individual contributors do not necessarily conform to the views of the editor. My apologies, if I am not able to agree with the approach and methodology adopted in some of the papers below.

In the absence of any professional proof-readers willing to proof-read this Volume with full of diacritics in a short time, I have had to do it all myself; I only crave the indulgence of the readers for the possible typos, which I must not put forward my myopic eyesight as the only excuse for.

Cover: the traditional image of the AtharvaVeda in the Kaikāḍī Mahārāj Maṭh at Paṇḍharʹpur, Maharashtra, photographed by the editor. Below it is the dhyāna-mantra (see p. 1) accompanying a similar icon of AtharvaṇaVeda (sic) at the entrance of the atirudra yajñaśālā in the temple of the godwoman Ānandamayī at Kanʹkhal near Haridvār in Uttaranchal.

Leiden, June 2002 Abhijit Ghosh

Acknowledgments

The editor received all possible help, in the course of editing this Volume, from a scholar who is, according to his/her own confession, "atharvavedapramatta" or obsessed with the AtharvaVeda, but would love to remain unnamed. Prof. Samiran Chandra Chakrabarti of Kolkata shared important insights from his vast knowledge. Prof. Pradyot Kumar Mukhopadhyay of the Philosophy Department of Jadavpur University, Kolkata suggested welcome stylistic improvements.

Thanks are especially due to the publisher, Mr. Abhoy Barman of the Sanskrit Book Depot, Kolkata for sponsoring such a non--profitable venture as this. The Volume has been very carefully laser--composed by Mr. Sanatan Karak of Laxmi Computer Centre (Badridas Temple Street, Kolkata) in a few months and printed with extraordinary care by Mr. Badal Mazumdar of C.S. Studio (Chhatu Babu Lane, Kolkata). I thank also my brother Mr. Smarajit Ghosh, M.A. for doing all the legwork to establish liaison between the editor on one hand and the publisher, the laser-composer and the printer on the other toward the publication of this Volume.

Contents

	Page(s)
Dedication	iii
Editorial	v
Acknowledgments	vi
Contents	vii-ix
Scheme of Transliteration	x
Contributors to the Volume	xi-xii

Ātharvaṇá

(a collection of essays on the AtharvaVeda with special reference to its Paippalāda tradition)

Overview

The Importance of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā and the Present State of Paippalāda Studies —Abhijit Ghosh 3-11

Indology and the AtharvaVeda in the Netherlands: Some Memories and Observations —Victor A. van Bijlert 12-25

The AtharvaVedic Genre and the Paippalāda Tradition

The Special Character of the AtharvaVeda: a Few Observations —Samiran Chandra Chakrabarti 27-34

Aspects of the Study of the Paippalāda AtharvaVedic Tradition —Arlo Griffiths 35-54

Studies in Individual Hymns

"Give myself to me": an Esoteric Interpretation of Paippalāda 1.6 —Julieta Moleanu 56-61

A TaittirīyaBrāhmaṇa Myth and Paippalāda 5.16 —Nirmala Kulkarni 62-70

Scheme of Transliteration

a ā i ī u ū ṛ ṝ ḷ ḹ

e ai (if not diphthong: aï) o au (if not diphthong: aü)

k kh g gh ṅ

c ch j jh ñ

ṭ ṭh ḍ (plus for NIA. languages: ṛ and for Vedic and for the Pali, Oriya and Marathi retroflex lateral: ḷ) ḍh (plus for NIA.: ṛh and for Vedic: ḷh) ṇ

t th d dh n

p ph b bh m

y (plus sometimes ẏ for inter-vocalic y in some NIA. languages) r l v

ś ṣ s h

ṃ (anusvāra) ~ or sometimes m̐ (anunāsika)

ḥ (visarjanīya, jihvāmūlīya, upadhmānīya)

A superscript [ˡ] placed between two consonants indicates that they are not joined in a conjunct consonant

(This scheme has not been followed in transliterating the dhyāna--mantra of the AtharvaVeda at p. 1.)

Contributors to the Volume

Tarak Nath Adhikari, Department of Sanskrit, Rabindra Bharati University, "Emerald Bower", 56A Barrackpore Trunk Road, Kolkata: 700 050 (India).
E-mail: <adhikaritarak_nath@rediffmail.com>

Shrikant Shankar Bahulkar, Balmukund Lohiya Centre of Sanskrit and Asian Studies, Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth, Vidyapeeth Bhavan, Gultekadi, Pune: 411 037 (India).
E-mail: <bahulkar@pn2.vsnl.net.in>
<bahulkar@vsnl.com>

Dipak Bhattacharya, Department of Sanskrit, Pali and Prakrit, Visva-Bharati [University], Santiniketan: 731 235 (India).
E-mail: <dbhattacharya2001@yahoo.co.in>

Vittorio Albert van Bijlert, (sponsored by BPCL.), Department of Indian Culture and History, Management Center for Human Values, Indian Institute of Management, Diamond Harbour Road, Joka, Kolkata: 700 104 (India). Postal address: MCHV, IIMC, P.O. Box 16757, Alipore, Kolkata: 700 027 (India).
E-mail: <vavanbijlert@rediffmail.com>
<vavanbijlert@yahoo.co.in>
<vavanbijlert@hotmail.com> (provisional)

Debabrata Chakrabarti, Department of Languages (German), University of Calcutta, 87/1 College Street, Kolkata: 700 073 (India).
E-mail: <debachakrabarti@yahoo.co.uk> (translated Klaus Mylius' paper from German)

Samiran Chandra Chakrabarti, School of Vedic Studies, Department of Sanskrit, Rabindra Bharati University, "Emerald Bower", 56A Barrackpore Trunk Road, Kolkata: 700 050 (India).
E-mail: <rbreg@cal3.vsnl.net.in> (provisional)

Abhijit Ghosh, Department of Sanskrit, Jadavpur University, 188 Raja Subodh Chandra Mullick Road, Kolkata: 700 032 (India).
E-mail: <a.ghosh@let.leidenuniv.nl> (temporary)
<abhijitbiswanathghosh@rediffmail.com>
<aghosh1953@yahoo.co.in>

Arlo Griffiths, CNWS/Instituut Kern, Universiteit Leiden, Postbus 9515, 2300 RA Leiden (The Netherlands).
E-mail: <a.griffiths@let.leidenuniv.nl>

Chintaman Ganesh Kashikar, 1489 Sadashiv Peth, Pune: 411 030 (India). Formerly of Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth, Vidyapeeth Bhavan, Gultekadi, Pune: 411 037 (India)

Nirmala Ravindra Kulkarni, (Ms.), Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Department of Sanskrit and Prakrit Languages, University of Pune, Ganeshkhind, Pune: 411 007 (India).
E-mail: <nirmala@unipune.ernet.in>

Julieta Adina Moleanu, (Ms.), Faculty of Letters, University of Oradea, Bd. Armata Romana, nos. 5-8, 3700 Oradea (Romania).
E-mail: <julieta_adina@yahoo.com>

Klaus Mylius, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, Georg-Voigt-Straße 8, D-6000 Frankfurt am Main 1 (Germany)

Satya Pal Narang, 31 Vidya Apartments, Opp. Jwala Puri: 5, Rohtak Road, Delhi: 110 087 (India). Formerly of the Department of Sanskrit, University of Delhi, Delhi: 110 007 (India)

Hukam Chand Patyal, D-6 Kasturba Wadi Society, Vishrant Wadi, Pune: 411 015 (India). Formerly of the Sanskrit Dictionary Department, Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, Pune: 411 006 (India)

Ganesh Umakant Thite, Department of Sanskrit and Prakrit Languages, University of Pune, Ganeshkhind, Pune: 411 007 (India).
E-mail: <gthite@unipune.ernet.in>

Kunja Bihari Upadhyaya, Swargadwar, Puri: 752 001 (India) (assisted Michael Witzel and Arlo Griffiths in writing their report)

Michael Witzel, Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University, 2 Divinity Avenue, Cambridge MA 02138 (U.S.A.).
E-mail: <witzel@fas.harvard.edu>

Ātharvaṇá

(a collection of essays on the AtharvaVeda
with special reference to its Paippalāda tradition)

a[a]tharva.naabhidho vedo
dhavalo marka.taanana.h/
ak.samaalaanvito vaame
dak.se kumbhadhara.h sm.rta.h//

Overview

The Importance of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā and the Present State of Paippalāda Studies

Abhijit Ghosh

Abstract

Importance of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā vis-à-vis the Śaunaka – present state of Paippalāda studies: international co-operation on the PaippalādaSaṃhitā – project for the treatment of its remaining kāṇḍas.

1. About the PaippalādaSaṃhitā and the AtharvaVeda

Among the most ancient and important sources for the social, geographical, religious, cultural and linguistic history of mankind is the large corpus of Vedic literature. Vedic was the language of the so-called Aryan tribes who hailed originally from Central Asia but in the latter half of the second millennium BCE gradually gained foothold in the northwestern part of South Asia.

The oldest strata (ranging from about 1500 to 1000 BCE) of this Vedic literature consist of collections of metrical hymns and prose formulas, composed almost entirely by members of priestly families, with a wide variety of purposes in mind. There are hymns in praise of deities, hymns recounting – in all manner of detail – the mythology connected with these deities, hymns portraying heroic feats of kings, hymns exhorting royal patrons to liberality, formulas to be pronounced by officiants at elaborate solemn rituals, organised by the upper echelon of society, etc.

Although such prototypical examples of the "high culture" often afford a valuable glance – between the lines – into the lives and minds of their composers, other material has also come down to us which stands in a much closer relationship with the actualities of ancient Indian day-to-day life. These more mundane hymns (which make up a "little tradition") were composed for use in rites performed in the domestic sphere (including rites de passage), and deal with topics as fear, hate, medicinal practices, social and natural calamities, etc. (cf. Bloomfield 1899).

Already at a very early stage, priestly families gathered their compositions in thematically organised collections (Saṃhitās), the oral transmission of which entailed a certain measure of division of labour between families. Some families focused on the transmission of hymns to be recited at solemn rituals (the ṚgVeda, the collection of which was called ṚgVedaSaṃhitā), others on the transmission of texts to be chanted (SāmaVeda, SāmaVedaSaṃhitā) or formulas to be pronounced (YajurVeda, YajurVedaSaṃhitā) at such occasions, and yet others on the transmission of the more mundane material mentioned above which was not relevant to the solemn ritual (AtharvaVeda, AtharvaVedaSaṃhitā) (cf. Gonda 1975).

The picture sketched so far is complicated by the fact that in the case of most of these Saṃhitās there are two, or even more versions (śākhās: "recensions" or "schools") of the same Saṃhitā. Although these recensions treat similar topics, they sometimes give rather different versions of what is more or less the same composition, and in addition often include substantial amounts of material not transmitted in any form in the parallel recensions (cf. Renou 1947).

In the case of the AtharvaVeda – the Veda of the "little tradition" which is the focus of the present Volume – the Saṃhitās of two recensions have come down to us: that of the Śaunakas and that of the Paippalādas. The text of the first was edited in 1856, while that of the Paippalādas – about a quarter of whose contents has no parallel in the Śaunaka version – has yet to be edited completely. Its existence has been known since the 1870s, when a single manuscript was discovered in Kashmir (cf. Roth 1875). More and better manuscripts were discovered in Eastern India, in Orissa, in the 1950s, but nearly 50 years later still only half of the text has been edited and published (Bhattacharya 1997), in an edition which unfortunately is quite unreliable in many respects (cf. Griffiths 2002). (It has, Bhattacharya: xxi claims, about some 8000 verses, i.e. 2000 more than the Śaunaka, which contains about 6000 mantras.)

Since the heyday of studies in the AtharvaVeda (Śaunaka) about a century ago, very little philological work has been done on the text of either recension (cf. Mylius 2000). Many problems thus

remain to be sloved. Since a substantial portion of the material in the PaippalādaSaṃhitā has at least some kind of parallel in the Śaunaka recension, a better knowledge of the Paippalāda-text will also contribute to the study of the Śaunaka-recension.

In fact, an important question which still has to be addressed is the exact nature of the relationship of the Paippalāda text to that of the Śaunaka recension, and to the ancillary literature of that recension (cf. Caland 1904). It needs to be determined whether one of the two recensions can be designated as more original, and to what extent a kind of Ur-AtharvaVeda can be reconstructed (cf. Witzel 1997: 275-83). As Renou (1947: 208) summarised for Vedic schools in general: "Le problème de la śākhā est au centre des problèmes védiques, et il est clair que si l'on réussisait à établir sur des bases solides la description et la filiation des écoles, on saurait du même coup comment s'est développé l'ensemble de védisme".

A better knowledge of the text of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā also promises to make substantial contribution to fields outside the direct purview of Vedic philology. Students of the history of (Vedic) religion, for example, have in the AtharvaVedic Saṃhitās a source comparable in importance to the ṚgVedaSaṃhitā. However, because the AtharvaVedic texts have been less studied and less available, their importance in this respect has not been at all adequately reflected in the handbooks of Vedic religion (e.g. Gonda 1978).

The Śaunaka recension contributed substantially to early advances in anthropological theory (cf. e.g. Hubert+Mauss 1898). With the growing emphasis on field-work in social anthropology, Vedic literature as a valuable source of data has in the course of this century been largely forgotten. A reliable translation of the text of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā might go a long way to re-enliven the interest in ancient Indian culture among social scientists. The AtharvaVedic Saṃhitās are not only a unique source for the religious and socio-political history of ancient India, but also contain a wealth of information on natural-historical circumstances and material culture of the oldest Vedic period. The abundance of new material in the PaippalādaSaṃhitā is sure to add many details to our knowledge of ancient Indian life, once the text becomes available in reliable form (A. Griffiths: personal communication).

One of the most important contributions a critical edition of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā will make is in the field of historical linguistics. Numerous unique forms (cf. e.g. Griffiths+Lubotsky) and hapax legomena occur, which in many cases are capable of furthering our knowledge and understanding of the Vedic language. Besides these, there is an unusually high number of words (in both versions of the AtharvaVeda) which cannot be explained as inheritances from the Indo-European proto-language, and which must be explained as borrowings from other contemporary languages (cf. the present writer's work on this last topic, Ghosh 2000). Insufficiently critical editions, such as Bhattacharya 1997, often obscure linguistically important data.

2. The international co-operation on the PaippalādaSaṃhitā

In view of the importance of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā, and in view of the unsatisfactory nature of the available edition, a number of scholars has since a few years been working toward the long-term goal of providing a complete edition of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā of the AtharvaVeda, with a translation and elaborate explanatory notes: a reliable source for the study of this very old, and in many respects most unique product of Vedic literature.

The entire text of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā consists of 20 books, of varying size, which make up a total of some 7500 verses. The books are organized purely by size of hymns, thematic aspects playing no role whatever (see table below). The first 15 books, which make up about half of the entire text, are now available in printed form (ed. Bhattacharya 1997), and the publication of the remaining five books has been announced as imminent. The editor (D. Bhattacharya) has at many places taken recourse to "underlining" the edited text – his method of indicating inability to reconstruct an acceptable text. The obligation to make editorial decisions has thus been avoided, and the method of "underlining" has moreover not been carried out with consistency: evidently corrupt passages have not been marked as such by underlining. The printed edition in many cases thus amounts to little more than a collation of manuscripts.

Taking as a starting point the available edition (i.e. the manuscripts there collated), but making use of additional manuscripts

gathered by Prof. Michael Witzel (Harvard University) and Arlo Griffiths (Ph.D. Research-fellow of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research at Leiden University), an international group of scholars has since a few years taken up the work of gradually bringing out truly "critical" re-editions of portions of the text, which – in view of its size and the enormous difficulties in editing it – cannot be dealt with by one scholar within a reasonable amount of time. Since, as stated above, thematic aspects play no important role in the organisation of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā (by contrast with the ŚaunakaSaṃhitā, cf. Devasthali 1966), the portion of text to be treated by each individual contributor has been selected mainly on the criterion of size. (The table gives information about only those scholars whose work on the particular book(s) has either been published or is about to be published or has been completed or is nearing completion.)

Table: Scholars involved in the project of re-editing the PaippalādaSaṃhitā

kāṇḍa number	hymns/verses	name of scholar	affiliation	status of work
1	112/483			
2	91/485	Thomas Zehnder	Univ. Zürich	Published 1999
3	40/278			
4	40/302	Alexander M. Lubotsky	Univ. Leiden	In progress
5	40/354	Alexander M. Lubotsky	Univ. Leiden	Published in Havard Oriental Series (Opera Minora), 2002
6	23/237	Arlo Griffiths	Univ. Leiden	In progress
7	20/211	Arlo Griffiths	Univ. Leiden	In progress
8	20/230			
9	29/304			
10	16/165			
11	16/148			
12	22/198			
13	9/65	Carlos Lopez	Harvard Univ.	Ph.D. 2000
14	9/84	Carlos Lopez	Harvard Univ.	Ph.D. 2000
15	23/227			
16	155/1361			
17	55/494			
18	82/734			
19	56/902			
20	65/637			

(It may be mentioned that a preliminary treatment of kāṇḍa 1 has been made by Thomas Zehnder in his 1993 Zürich M.A. thesis (Vedische Studien), and of kāṇḍa 19, hymns 1-10 by Arlo Griffiths in his 1998 Leiden M.A. thesis (The Paippalāda Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda).)

The work of these scholars is based on a careful study of the idiosyncrasies of the oral and written transmission of the text (Witzel 1973-76, 1985); a close scrutiny of parallel passages in the same text, as well as in other Vedic texts; and a careful eye for the language of the text, whose grammatical and metrical peculiarities have not yet been studied systematically. These are all matters which Bhattacharya has largely ignored in preparing his edition (cf. Griffiths 2002). The text is often very obscure even to the specialist. In order to make it accessible both to other Vedic scholars and to scholars working in other fields (such as linguistics, history, and social anthropology), the scholars active in this project supply their critically edited text with a(n English) translation and a philological and exegetical commentary. They are in constant communication with each other through the e-mail "list" devoted to Paippalāda-studies, <paippalaada@eGroups.com>, which is administered by Arlo Griffiths. The first published product of the international project, Dr. Thomas Zehnder's Ph.D. thesis which was published in 1999, was lavishly praised by a competent reviewer (Mylius 2000).

3. The project for the treatment of the remaining kāṇḍas

Leiden has become once again the centre of international studies on the PaippalādaSaṃhitā, with two scholars (Lubotsky, Griffiths) working actively on the text, and a few others (H.W. Bodewitz, Jan E.M. Houben, Leonid Kulikov) closely involved in the progress of their work as well. It had already been the centre of such studies in the early '80s when the former Professor of Sanskrit at the University of Leiden, Prof. Witzel, inaugurated a "Veda-Project", under whose auspices our colleague Dipak Bhattacharya, the editor of the edition of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā referred to above, spent a year at Leiden University in 1981-82. (For details see V.A. van Bijlert's article printed in this Volume.) The fruits of this older "Veda-Project" have been i.a. a small collection of manuscripts for the PaippalādaSaṃhitā

acquired by Witzel during preliminary fieldwork in India in 1983, as well as – very importantly, and uniquely in those early days of computers – an "electronic text" of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā, which in a revised version is still being used nowadays by the groups of scholars working on the text (the most recent version is available with A. Griffiths, and is also accessible (with restrictions) online at http://titus.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de/texte (cf. Griffiths+Zehnder 1998--99).

Dr. Zehnder spent one year at Leiden University, preparing his Zürich Ph.D. thesis (Zehnder 1999), under the guidance of Prof. Lubotsky, in the year 1997-98. Arlo Griffiths, who is preparing his Ph.D. dissertation under the guidance of Professors Bodewitz and Lubotsky, has by now made four fieldtrips in Orissa, and his search for manuscripts of the texts has been very successful (see Griffiths 2003). Over the last few years, the Leiden scholars have been coming together on a weekly basis to discuss the editorial work on the PaippalādaSaṃhitā done by Zehnder, Lubotsky and Griffiths.

Moreover, to make contributions towards filling the gaps in the table above, by preparing critical editions, accompanied by translations and extensive commentaries, of the texts of the remaining kāṇḍas of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā, in all seven scholars from various universities like Harvard, Jadavpur, Leiden, Oxford and Sapporo are engaged in working, or have planned to work, on other substantial parts of this important text, on books 8-11, 15, 17-19, within the International Project, described above. These works will be carried out along the same lines as followed by Zehnder (1999) and A. Griffiths in his forthcoming Leiden Ph.D. thesis. The principal method will be text-critical. This philological method will be applied to primary sources both in manuscript and published form, with constant reference to secondary sources, in order to achieve the goals of the international co-operative project.

4. References

Bhattacharya, Dipak. 1997 (ed.). The Paippalāda-saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda. Volume one, consisting of the first fifteen kāṇḍas. Calcutta

Bloomfield, Maurice. 1899. The Atharva-Veda and the Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa. Strassburg

Caland, Willem. 1904. "Zur Atharvavedalitteratur". In: Wiener Zeitschrift zur Kunde des Morgenlandes (Wien) 18: 185-207

Devasthali, G.V. 1966. "The Form and the Arrangement of the Atharva--Veda". Pp. 43-53 in Professor Birinchi Kumar Barua Commemoration Volume, ed. by M. Neog and M.M. Sharma, Gauhati. Also: "Form and Arrangement of the Atharvaveda". In: Indian Antiquary, 3rd series (Bombay) 2.4 (October 1967): 29--39

Ghosh, Abhijit. 2000. Non-Aryan Linguistic Elements in the AtharvaVeda [a Study of Some Words of Austric Origin]. Calcutta

2002 (ed.). Ātharvaṇá (a collection of essays on the AtharvaVeda with special reference to its Paippalāda tradition). Kolkata

Gonda, Jan. 1975. Vedic Literature (Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas). Wiesbaden

²1978. Die Religionen Indiens I. Veda und älterer Hinduismus. Stuttgart etc.

Griffiths, Arlo. 2002. "Aspects of the Study of the Paippalāda AtharvaVedic Tradition". In: Ghosh (2002)

200X. "The Orissa Manuscripts of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā". In: Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft (Leipzig etc.) 153 (2003)

Griffiths, A. & Lubotsky, A. 1999. "Postscript on Vedic *jaṅgahe*". In: Journal of the American Oriental Society (New Haven) 119: 480-81

Griffiths, A. & Zehnder, T. 1998-99. Electronic Text of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā, kāṇḍas 1-15. URL: http://titus.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcc/ind/aind/-ved/av/avp

Hubert, H. & Mauss, M. 1898. "Essai sur la Nature et la Fonction du Sacrifice". In: L'Année Sociologique (Paris) 2: 29-138

Mylius, Klaus. 2000. Review of Zehnder 1999. In: Indo-Iranian Journal (The Hague etc.) 43: 295-98

Renou, Louis. 1947. Les Écoles Védiques et la Formation du Véda. Paris

Roth, Rudolf von. 1875. Der Atharvaveda in Kaschmir. Tübingen

Witzel, Michael. 1973, 1976. "On the Reconstruction of the Authentic Paippalāda-Saṃhitā". Part I. In: Journal of the Ganganath Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth (Allahabad) 29 (1973): 463-88. Part II. In: JGJKSV. 32 (1976): 137-68

1985. "Die mündliche Tradition der Paippalādins von Orissa". Pp. 259-87 in Festschrift Karl Hoffmann, vol. 1 [= Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft (München) 44]

1997. "The Development of the Vedic Canon and its Schools: the Social and Political Milieu". Pp. 257-345 in Inside the Texts, Beyond the Texts, ed. by M. Witzel, Cambridge (Massachusetts)

Zehnder, T. 1999 (ed. & transl.). Atharvaveda Paippalāda, Buch 2, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar. Idstein

Acknowledgment

I am extremely grateful to Arlo Griffiths, without whose help it would not have been possible for me to write this introductory.

Indology and the AtharvaVeda in the Netherlands: Some Memories and Observations

Victor A. van Bijlert

Abstract

The author tries to give in this incisive, delightful-reading paper a picture of the recent state of the study of Indology in general and of the AtharvaVeda (Paippalāda recension) in particular in the Netherlands, in course of which he presents some reminiscences of his student days. He also makes some comments with regard to the position of Sanskrit learning in India these days.

What makes a Dutch person study Indian languages and culture? This seems a simple enough question. The answers usually run: "I am interested in Indian culture, philosophy (most often), art, literature". Once I heard somebody say: "I am fascinated by the sounds of Indian languages". What about myself? I think most of these motivations were there. Before I began the formal study of Indology I had read about Indian culture, in any case enough to make me decide to study it in university. Where did this interest come from? For an answer I have to dig in my memory and excavate my earliest acquaintance with things Indian. I have to return to when I was about nine years old. I was studying at a school in my home town The Hague in the Netherlands.[1]

In those days not many children of non-European origin were living in the Netherlands and hence very few were studying in Dutch schools. When an Indian girl came in our class it really was an event. She attracted the admiring attention of the other children. I do not remember her last name but her first name I do remember: Rañjanā. Of course we grossly mispronounced it: with Dutch long "a's" and the stress on the second syllable. The "j" was pronounced as "y". Her parents worked at the Indian Embassy. She was tall, had large brown eyes and long black hair. What boy would not be moved to dream?

Soon after, two Indian boys were admitted to the school. They were brothers. The elder one was placed in our class. This boy – whose name I have of course totally forgotten – told me that as a

European I would never be able to pronounce the ancient name of Delhi properly: Indraprastha. I probably wanted to face both challenges thrown at me – Indian beauty and difficult languages – for the rest of my life. I can say with gratitude that I have been blessed with the fulfilment of the first while the second remains a life-time endeavour.

My deeper philosophical interest in India came some years later. My maternal grandmother with whom I had a great rapport, owned many books on Indian culture and religion. Most of these were Dutch translations from English, including books by Rabindranath Tagore of whose works she was very fond. I must have been about fourteen when I read a slim volume of Dutch translations of the classical verse Upaniṣads. I read the booklet in a single session. It totally knocked me off my feet. I was acquainted with the New Testament, but the Upaniṣads seemed to offer a fantastic complement to the teachings of Jesus Christ. I belonged to a generation that was not raised in a strict orthodox Protestant way, but rather in a liberal Christian manner. Thus I did not see any stark contradiction between the moral teachings of Jesus, the Buddha and the Upaniṣads. Nowadays, I find that a good number of Dutch Christians think in the same way. Where the New Testament is rather silent about the nature of God, the soul and the direct experience of the Divine, the Upaniṣads seem to teach nothing but remarkably convincing intuitions in this regard.

Soon after, I got a Dutch translation of the BhagavadGītā which only further corroborated my initial enthusiasm for the Upaniṣads. This Dutch translation of the BhagavadGītā dates back from 1919 and was made directly from Sanskrit by the Dutch Indologist/theosophist J. Boissevain. Boissevain's language is absolutely horrible in that he is trying to find literal Dutch parallels for every Sanskrit word with philosophical meaning in the original text. But by often reading his translation I got a feel of the philosophical depth of the original. A more elegant literary rendering which skews off the correct meaning, may not have conveyed much. Boissevain renders the "guṇa"s of "prakṛti", with something like: the "head--parts of the original independence". But Boissevain was thoroughly consistent and meticulous in his translation. He revised his text three

times, between 1909 and the final edition of 1919. To me the Gītā seemed to be a kind of "Hindu" New Testament. In the meantime I had tried to read and digest Swami Vivekananda's books dealing with the four Yogas, selections from the Pali canon and some Mahāyāna Sūtras. By now I was reading the Buddhist texts in English, continuously consulting an English-Dutch pocket dictionary.

When I was sixteen I decided I should study Sanskrit in university. I had finished an elementary form of education and worked extra to gain entry in a higher level school that would enable me to go to the university. Luckily I could register with the "Populier School", a Protestant Christian school in my neighbourhood. This school taught Greek and Latin. I assumed a preparatory study of these classical languages would enable me to grasp Sanskrit more easily. And besides, I wanted to know some Greek for the New Testament and Greek philosophy. I had no great passion for Latin, however. In Dutch such a school is called a "gymnasium". There the classical languages are taught along with the sciences. Nowadays there are only very few integral gymnasiums left, because the demand has declined. When the Netherlands was still predominantly believing Christian and church-going, the gymnasium was a necessary preliminary for the study of theology in university and the subsequent training of church ministers. With the present-day decline of Christianity this demand dramatically dropped. Theological faculties are also closed down. Thus the secular globalising free market has accomplished what even the Nazi-occupation in the Netherlands could not. Interestingly enough, the non-Christian secularisation in the Netherlands seems to have gone hand in hand with the decline of Social Democracy and the rise of its absolute opposite, neo-liberalism of the most harsh kind.

I still have very fond memories of the "Populier School". As students we discussed many things idealistic youths of those days used to be interested in: literature, poetry, religion, politics (Marxism, because we believed it promised a better world, a world Jesus Christ might have wanted us to build), and the vicissitudes of puberty. Our teachers were always interested in our debates and encouraged us a lot in that direction. We were supposed to grow into independently thinking, critical, and socially responsible, young citizens.[2] I had a classmate in those days who excelled in Greek and Latin. Coming from a strict Christian background, it was his life's mission to study theology and become a minister. Together we often discussed Christianity and other religions. I invariably brought in my little knowledge of Hindu and Buddhist scriptures. Many of our teachers and fellow students always expected both of us to study theology and become ministers. I could sometimes impress the Greek class with my little knowledge of the Devanāgarī script which I had taught myself and some verses in Sanskrit. To my fellow students I must have seemed a terrible prig. In my spare time I was studying the Sanskrit Grammar of Prof. Jan Gonda and tried to decipher the Sanskrit text of the Gītā with the help of Macdonnell's dictionary.

In 1975 I passed the school exams and after the summer vacation went to Leiden University to begin the study of Indology there. I was genuinely looking forward to it. I expected a continuation of my pleasant school days, but now at a much higher intellectual level with "real professors" who knew infinitely much more than I did and whose knowledge I could now imbibe to my heart's content.

Hoping to be practical, I did not opt for the purely classical Sanskrit variant but chose from the first year also modern Hindi.[3] I was interested in Bengali already then, and I assumed that some Hindi would help in this respect. Our two lecturers for Hindi, Dr. Schokker for grammar and old Hindi and Dr. Gautam for modern Hindi had said that I could only study some Bengali after finishing a B.A. in Hindi. Both gentlemen taught well, but to my regret the main emphasis was on grammar, etymology and reading, not on the spoken language.

After three years of painstakingly deciphering short stories by Premchand and caupāi dohās in Old Avadhi, I felt more attracted to Indian philosophy. This meant more Sanskrit and some classical Tibetan. The text that really made me change my mind was Gauḍapāda's so-called Māṇḍūkya-kārikās. I was reading this work in the remarkable edition of Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya, under Prof. Vetter's guidance.[4] Vetter always admired Bhattacharya's edition as

an exemplary work on Indian philosophy. Vetter's forte was really the way he taught Indian philosophical Sanskrit texts in small seminars where all the students would sit well-prepared with the original and their own translations. One was supposed to read the Sanskrit in class. Vetter's method was to understand the subtleties of a given Indian philosophical work from its own "small" context. For Vetter this meant that one often would have to try and think along the same lines as the author, yet keeping the text strictly in view. One should of course not impose one's own hypotheses onto the text, but should on the other hand be creative enough to extract new meanings out of it. For this one must always take the lectio difficilior into consideration.

Unlike some other Sanskrit philologists, Vetter would only study those texts he considered to be of real philosophical and spiritual value: texts with a high classical status or important content. This "bias" of his excluded to a large extent Indian texts on logic, Tantric texts, Kāvya, and the Veda Saṃhitās. About texts on logic Vetter used to say that they "wish to carry home the truth in a basket".

Vetter's most memorable classes were on Buddhist texts; Suttas from the Pali Tipiṭaka, Mahāyāna Sūtras, especially those dealing with Prajñāpāramitā; and Buddhist philosophers such as Nāgārjuna, Vasubandhu and Dharmakīrti. In Vetter's view these texts and authors together with some works from the early Advaita Vedānta tradition, constitute the very heights of Indian classical civilisation. In teaching these, Vetter ensured that his students would be acquainted with these best products of ancient Indian intellect.

With later developments such as the Navyanyāya and the bhakti-oriented Vedānta, Vetter did not have much patience. Modern Hinduism invited his sceptical remarks, for in his opinion the latter never rises to the intellectual heights of the classical period. Thus Vetter's approach to Indian culture was and is classicist, historical and philological. In his view, the best of ancient Indian thought ought to inform, inspire and moderate modern Hinduism.

In his method of research Vetter (originally of South-German Protestant background) is the inheritor of the Western Christian

Reformation of the sixteenth century and the Indian Renaissance of the nineteenth century.[5] Later in his professional life Vetter exclusively concentrated on ancient Buddhism. For his researches in the earliest stages of the Buddhist doctrine he collates different sources in Pali, Sanskrit, Chinese and Tibetan. Behind all this is the thrust of Vetter's philological-historical method of research.

There could have hardly been two more contrasting personalities in Leiden Indology than the silent and meticulous Prof. Vetter on the one hand and on the other the flamboyant Prof. Jan Heesterman. Although both Sanskritists (by conviction), their scientific interest in the study of Indian civilisation is totally different. Vetter looks at the significant details within a single text, Heesterman draws huge conclusions from a large bird's eye's view of the whole of Indian civilisation and history, preferably in comparison and contrast to the whole of Western civilisation. In his work Heesterman combines the analysis of a social scientist (mostly sociology of religion) with the erudition of a world-historian and the philological sharpness of his Sanskritist background. His interests range from Vedic śrauta sacrifices – especially the Rājasūya – to the decline of the Mughal empire, the Mahrattas under the Peshwas and the Dutch East India company in the seventeenth century. He is equally at home in all these and more subjects.

In 1977 Dr. Michael Witzel was appointed professor of Sanskrit – with an emphasis on Vedic and ancient Iranian – at Leiden University. His equally eminent colleague in those days in Leiden was Prof. Hans Peter Schmidt. The latter had left Leiden. Witzel came in his place, bringing his vast experience of living in South Asia. After all, Witzel had spent some years in Kathmandu searching for Sanskrit manuscripts and preserving and cataloguing them. Witzel had also travelled in India. All this was refreshingly new to us students. Here was a Sanskrit professor who had actually lived in South Asia for much longer than two years. Heesterman had spent about two years in Pune before his appointment in Leiden. Vetter had spent very little time in South Asia. But Witzel knew the place very well, and had been on this most exciting manuscript hunt. After all, manuscripts were and still are the raw material on which the science of Indology rests.

Witzel always talked with great enthusiasm about his time in South Asia. This stimulated in some students a strong desire to follow in his footsteps, and some of them really did. In his classes Witzel often turned to anthropology to explain the migratory movements of the Vedic tribes. Sometimes he would refer to astronomy to explain what a Vedic seer poet might have meant. Witzel knew the night sky of the relevant South Asian areas very well. Witzel's classes were an exciting blend of philology, history and social sciences. My own interest in the latter is partly due to Witzel (and Heesterman and the historian Prof. Dirk Kolff).

In those days in the late seventies of the twentieth century it was still possible to ask for special classes on a given topic (nowadays all classes are strictly regulated in time tables). Together with Vetter, Witzel held a memorable class on the BṛhadĀraṇyaka Upaniṣad and another one on the Kaṭha Upaniṣad. In the latter class Witzel drew on his knowledge of Vedic ritualistic texts and clarified problems concerning the fire altar mentioned in the first chapter of the Kaṭha Upaniṣad. Classes on hymns from the ṚgVeda and the AtharvaVeda were always intellectually challenging, although some students would have preferred a more school-like approach. For those who could appreciate Witzel's multi-disciplinary approach to texts, his classes showed how interpretative work on the Veda Saṃhitās could be fruitfully done. Here he often pointed to the immediate linguistic and ideological closeness between the Vedas and the ancient Gāthās of Zarathustra. In his teaching as in his writing, Witzel was always extremely meticulous. He had a keen eye for every single little detail. At times, a discussion of a single line from a Vedic mantra could last for a few hours.

It was in this highly charged setting that I first got acquainted with the philology of the AtharvaVedaSaṃhitā. Witzel taught us how the "fixed" printed texts of the Saṃhitās were in reality far more fluid if one looked at the manuscript evidence and the variety of texts. There were always more recensions of a Saṃhitā, as indeed of many other Vedic texts as well, such as Brāhmaṇas, Āraṇyakas, let alone Upaniṣads. This fact by itself was already interesting to learn. The printed texts – no matter how well edited with critical apparatus and notes – only constitute a particular version of a given text. This

is of course also true and even more true of for instance Mahāyāna Sūtras. Also the critical edition of the MahāBhārata shows the fluid character of such a voluminous and famous text. The idea that one needs to fix the "original" text of a work transmitted through writing, stems from the Western Renaissance and the Reformation when it was thought necessary to know exactly what the "Urtext" of the sacred Scripture must have contained and what not. Judaism had solved this problem by fixing the canon and adding numerous commentaries to it. This was also done in the case of the Quran. The Vedas, however, are a vast and not too fixed body of sacred literature.[6]

The AtharvaVeda was no exception to this. We possess it in two recensions: Śaunaka and Paippalāda. The "fixed" printed version of Roth's edition is based on the Śaunaka tradition. The Paippalāda recension was known by name but its content was not known. It was an exciting story to hear from Witzel how the PaippalādaSaṃhitā had been rediscovered by Prof. Durgamohan Bhattacharyya in Orissa.[7] Subsequently a project had been started to publish it. The Orissa manuscripts were collated with the famous but not very intelligible Kashmir manuscript of the AtharvaVedaSaṃhitā. All this information we got from Witzel. We learned from him how a critical edition on the basis of manuscripts could be produced. For me as a student this was all very exciting. It was like going back to the pioneering times of Fort William College and the Asiatic Society of the times of Sir William Jones.

Luckily for us, Prof. Durgamohan's son, Prof. Dipak Bhattacharya, stayed at Leiden for about a year. He had come to the Netherlands in the early eighties of the twentieth century in connection with the proposed "Paippalāda Project" as the scholarly world in those days referred to it. Prof. Dipak Bhattacharya was like a friend and philosopher to a few of us, especially me. From his vast learning I greatly benefitted, in particular regarding the position of Sanskrit learning in contemporary India. After my Hindi teacher, Dr. Mohan Gautam, Prof. Bhattacharya was the second Indian intellectual from whom I learned about modern India. I could never picture myself studying ancient Sanskrit texts totally divorced from a context, especially a modern context. After Prof. Bhattacharya returned

to India and Prof. Witzel left for Harvard some years later, the Paippalāda Project seemed to have died. Personal differences of opinion between Prof. Heesterman, Prof. Witzel and Prof. Bhattacharya had also contributed to the demise. These differences of opinion need a little more explanatory background.

A remarkable phenomenon in Dutch Indology in those days was the idea that publishing critical editions of Sanskrit texts was better left to European scholars than Indian ones. In fact any interpretation of ancient Indian texts was better done by European philologists, who would be more "neutral" and "faithful to the original". This idea has not entirely disappeared even nowadays. But the way we were taught Indology in the seventies this was almost an article of faith. Any Indological endeavour was always better and more meticulously executed if done by a European scholar. Indian Indologists could at best be tolerated if they were good and politely ignored if they were less than good. The sound Indian Indologist would have less trouble in gaining acceptance in Western circles than bad ones, obviously. What was slightly mischievous on the part of some Dutch scholars was to refuse to fully recognise the obvious differences between a good Indian Indologist and a bad one. Perhaps a little bit of the colonial mentality was still lingering on, if only very subliminally. Some remarkable instances of strange Indian Indologists may suffice to make the point.

I vividly remember a visit of an Indian scholar (whose name I have forgotten) to Leiden sometime in the mid-seventies of the last century. Unfortunately he talked rubbish. For instance in passing he claimed that a five-thousand year old television camera had been excavated from Kurukshetra. This camera had obviously been used to record the battle of Kurukṣetra. Television had been the divyacakṣu of Sañjaya. Another visiting Indian "scholar" once claimed that the fact that in North-Holland one can see stone-carved images of a cow over the door of a farm, proved that the Vedic culture in ancient times had spread all the way to the Netherlands, let's say about four thousand years ago. Of course such examples of Indian Indological "scholarship" only reinforced the Western scholars in their idea that European scholars would remain more "neutral" and "faithful to the original texts". The Europeans, however, were largely themselves to

blame: they invited such "scholars" from India. Clearly the Europeans could not distinguish between ripe and green among Indian Indologists.

Indian insiders would of course have known that intelligent Indian university students would very seldom go for Sanskrit studies: economically not very viable. Thus the quality of Sanskrit scholarship in India suffered and still suffers perhaps. The second problem is that Sanskrit studies may have been a refuge already in the late sixties for less bright students with Sangh Parivar leanings. All these facts Dutch Sanskritists in the seventies simply could not and would not take notice of because they were absolutely not interested in modern India.[8] On the other hand, no European historian, not even in Leiden University, would deny the world-wide importance of modern Indian historians and social scientists. The Subaltern Studies group originating from Calcutta and Delhi has entered in a big way in the European and North American academic imagination. Ranajit Guha, Gayatri Chakraborty and Partha Chatterjee are among the main subaltern luminaries. Every historian reads Tapan Raychaudhuri. In the field of economics Amartya Sen is recognised all over the world. In every international sociological forum there is somebody who knows Andre Beteille. But Indian Sanskritists have hardly performed a similar feat as yet (nor has the majority of European Sanskritists for that matter). The best times for Sanskrit scholarship were probably the eighties. After that Sanskrit studies came under significant threat.

The vicissitudes of life under growing economisation in the sphere of academic education began to take their toll. The first casualties are always the "orchid subjects". In the mid-eighties the Dutch Government had appointed a commission under the chairmanship of Prof. Jan Staal (the famous Dutch Sanskritist) to produce fresh proposals for the reorganisation of the "small philological subjects", such as Chinese, Indian languages, Indonesian languages, Japanese, Korean, Arabic, Turkish and Persian (accounting for a mere two-thirds of the world population). Although the contrary was intended, Indology nationwide suffered heavily from this positive excercise.

In the sixties and the seventies there were at least thirty people

employed in Dutch universities who were teaching and researching subjects connected with Indian culture, ranging from Sanskrit philology, philosophy, art history, music to modern Hindi short stories and Tamil devotional poetry. In the early nineties this number had dwindled to about ten people (now, to four or five!). Three departments were closed down, and the remainder was merged and located in Leiden, traditionally the oldest and strongest place in the Netherlands for philology of any kind.[9]

In the eighties of the twentieth century there was already a division of labour between Leiden and Amsterdam regarding the study of India. Leiden would concentrate mainly on Indian philology, cultural history and political history; Amsterdam would study India from the modern perspective of cultural anthropology and non-Western sociology. In other words, Amsterdam was supposed to represent the practical developmental approach to India, Leiden the elitist cultural approach. This division was and still is often a cause of conflict. When the Dutch Government needs to know something about India from the development perspective, they would turn rather to Amsterdam than to Leiden. Amsterdam is thus considered to be progressive and modern, Leiden old-fashioned and looking towards the past. Under these circumstances to preserve interest in the study of Sanskrit philology and to even promote research on for instance the Vedas amounts to a miracle. If not a miracle, it at least requires a lot of courage and optimism. But there are those who passionately pursue for instance AtharvaVeda studies against all odds. And this latter phrase I emphasise, because nowadays it is fashionable to show contempt for intellectuals. Even, or rather especially, academies show these tendencies. In order to avoid the odium of impracticality some Dutch universities, among which is Leiden University, have now developed "management courses" and a "business school". In their perception this goes a long way to look trendy, to keep up with the times, to attract more students and to show to the Government that universities are really not what neo-liberal (former social-democrat) opinion-leaders make them out to be.

The old Paippalāda Project had died years ago. How and why this happened is a totally different story. There were of course the usual differences of opinion between the various players: the professors Heesterman and Witzel on the one hand and Prof. Dipak Bhattacharya on the other hand. The sense of cooperation had evaporated, perhaps partly because of the high-handedness of the Leiden faculty of arts. But luckily for Leiden, a new loose group of Paippalāda enthusiasts has emerged a few years ago. This group comprises established scholars like Prof. Sacha Lubotsky (an expert on Indo-European), Dr. Leonid Kulikov, Mrs. Drs. Marianne Oort and Drs. Arlo Griffiths. This Leiden group was cooperating with Prof. Witzel and Dr. Carlos Lopez at Harvard. Manuscript research was done in Kyoto by Prof. Yasuke Ikari and again in Zürich by Dr. Thomas Zehnder. (See Abhijit Ghosh's article published in this Volume for the latest position.)

One of the great achievements in the field of Paippalāda studies has been the publication of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā by Prof. Dipak Bhattacharya. His edition is an important landmark in the world of Vedic studies. It is evident that a good edition of a Vedic Saṃhitā is essential for our understanding of the history of Indian culture seen from a long-term perspective. And in this regard genuine scholars like Prof. Dipak Bhattacharya make all the difference. His edition will be used for a long time to come.

This brings me to a general point with regard to the study of Sanskrit and Vedic texts. The relative neglect of Sanskrit learning in India has facilitated a rather dangerous phenomenon: the politicisation and falsification of the so-called Hindu past and its civilisation. This neglect enables certain political forces to abuse the relative ignorance of the general public, while supposedly responsible intellectuals ignore or reject the ancient and medieval Sanskrit legacy (often on the plea of secularism). The Sanskrit heritage thus becomes the preserve of unscrupulous religious preachers and political con men.

Is there a remedy? We cannot perhaps seriously maintain that the study of Indian cultural production – of which Sanskrit texts form a significant part – will save us from political perils. Nor does such study solve age-old socio-economic problems such as inequality of opportunity, upper caste and upper class hegemony, lack of universal education, political violence etc. What I am looking forward to is not a conservative (if not outright reactionary) revival of

ancient Indian culture (as if such a thing were at all possible!); but a judicious renaissancist interest in ancient and medieval Indian texts, art-forms, sciences etc. In the face of the challenges of modernity, one may need an educated and sophisticated background in Indian cultural history. Ancient Indian texts are not only the remnants of an irretrievable past, they also contain values of permanent importance. The approach to them ought to be philosophical rather in the way we approach Plato and Aristotle. Their works are still being studied, not because we are looking back to ancient Greece but because Plato and Aristotle had things to say of lasting interest. Western academies have not yet thrown out classical studies for this reason. We need the critical dialogue with the most eminent minds of the past even if we thoroughly disagree with many of their views.

Let us not forget that Western modernity owes much to the rediscovery of the Greek heritage and the original version of the Bible in Hebrew and Greek. The Western Renaissance and the Western Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century were twin phenomena that brought about Western humanist and modern thought. Democratic temper owes as much to Erasmus and John Calvin as to Thomas Paine and Rousseau. The Reformation in Europe provided the first ideological motivation for modernising European society, away from its late-medieval feudal past. Similarly, the first intellectual rediscovery of the ancient Vedāntic texts in the beginning of the nineteenth century in Eastern India brought about a social and political movement now called the Indian Renaissance. Academic Sanskrit studies owe their origin to the latter. But also Indian nationalism and Indian modernity. We should preserve that tradition and build on it.

Notes

[1] The interesting thing about The Hague is that it is the seat of Government, the Dutch Queen lives in The Hague, the Parliament and most of the Ministries are located in The Hague, so are most of the embassies, and yet it is not the capital of the Netherlands. The capital is Amsterdam. The Netherlands is probably the only country in the world with this arrangement.

[2] But leftism was rather fashionable in those days. Today there is no trace left of it. Except for a few scattered people who refuse to believe in the new gospel of economic liberalism, privatisation and social inequality.

[3] Actually one was supposed to study Hindi from the second year onwards, if one chose a second Indian language next to Sanskrit.

[4] This edition originally appeared in 1943 from the University of Calcutta. In Vetter's days, only the old print was available in our library as a rare book. Fortunately, this important book has been reprinted in 1989 by Motilal Banarsidass!

[5] I remember Vetter had some esteem for the writings of Raja Rammohun Roy. He once said that when India began to neglect the thought of Rammohun she missed the chance of a lifetime.

[6] Hinduism acknowledges the Vedas as sacred texts but does not regard them as infallible and literal revelations of God. In ancient times there were different views on the origin and the authority of the Vedas.

[7] As a young man my father-in-law, Śrī. Raghumaṇi Bhaṭṭācārya from Midnapore later Kharagpur, had assisted Prof. Durgamohan Bhattacharyya in locating Paippalāda Brahmins. Relatively unknown to the outside world they were scattered over Orissa, West Bengal and Bihar (now Jharkhand).

[8] I remember that I used to carefully warn Dutch colleagues of Sangh Parivar propagandists posing as Indological scholars. But all I invited was Dutch hostility: who was I to dare criticise Indians? With hindsight it is now clear that Dutch scholars needed Indian fools to shine the brighter themselves.

[9] Leiden University was the first university in the Netherlands. It was founded in 1575 as a reward for the bravery of the population of Leiden which had resisted the Spanish troops for more than a year. The Dutch, under the leadership of Prince William of Orange-Nassau, were engaged in a revolutionary war of independence against the Spanish king Philips the Second. The Dutch regard William of Orange as the "father of the fatherland". The war of independence lasted for eighty years (1568-1648). The Dutch declared themselves the Republic of the Seven United Provinces in 1581. The main ideology behind this revolution was Calvinism.

The AtharvaVedic Genre and the Paippalāda Tradition

The Special Character of the AtharvaVeda: a Few Observations

Samiran Chandra Chakrabarti

Abstract

De-emphasizing the prevailing characterizations of the AtharvaVeda, the paper expounds its heterogeneous character, and aims at establishing that it is a misconception that the AtharvaVeda was not accorded the Veda status for a long time (the expression trayī merely meant three varieties of mantras, viz. verse, prose and music, of which the first two are contained in the AtharvaVeda). Since it laid little stress on Śrauta rites, the AtharvaVeda was ignored in the Śrauta tradition, but the contributions of the Atharvans and Aṅgirases were recorded with esteem in connection with other Vedas as well.

Abbreviations

AiBr. = AitareyaBrāhmaṇa; ĀpGS. = ĀpastambaGṛhyaSūtra; ĀśvŚrS. = ĀśvalāyanaŚrautaSūtra; AV. = AtharvaVeda; AVP. = AtharvaVeda (Paippalāda); AVŚ. = AtharvaVeda (Śaunakīya); BṛhĀUp. = BṛhadĀraṇyakOpaniṣad; ChāndUp. = ChāndogyOpaniṣad; GPBr. = GoPathaBrāhmaṇa; JBr. = JaiminīyaBrāhmaṇa; JUBr. = JaiminīyOpaniṣadBrāhmaṇa; KenUp. = KenOpaniṣad; PVBr. = PañcaViṃśaBrāhmaṇa; ṚV. = ṚgVeda; ŚāṅkhBr. = ŚāṅkhāyanaBrāhmaṇa; ŚPBr. = ŚataPathaBrāhmaṇa; ṢVBr. = ṢaḍViṃśaBrāhmaṇa; TBr. = TaittirīyaBrāhmaṇa; TS. = TaittirīyaSaṃhitā; VS. = VājasaneyiSaṃhitā

Controversy ever rages over the question whether the AtharvaVeda was regarded originally as a Veda in view of the trayī apparently excluding the AtharvaVeda. Now, the terms ṚgVeda, YajurVeda and SāmaVeda were not used in early Vedic texts – neither in the Saṃhitās, nor in early Brāhmaṇas (they occur in this sense in AiBr. 5.32 (25.7), ŚPBr. 11.5.8.3, ṢVBr. 4.1.2 (5.1.2), JBr. 1.357, GPBr. 1.1.6). Instead, we come across the expressions of ṛcaḥ, sāmāni, yajūṃṣi in plural for the three varieties or literary genres of Vedic literature. This indicates that trayī was used in the sense of the three varieties of mantras. True to this practice, Jaimini, too, defines ṛc, yajus and sāman – verse, prose and music –, the three varieties found in the Vedic Saṃhitās. The AtharvaVeda, too, contains verse and prose – hence no separate definition was necessary. And AtharvaVeda also refers to these varieties in the same way, e.g., it

mentions ṛc, sāman and yajus (AVŚ. 7.54.1-2 (56, 57.1) : AVP. 20.25.3, 57.1; AVŚ. 9.6.1-2 : AVP. 16.111.1-2). TBr. 3.12.9.1 mentions atharvan-s along with ṛc, sāman and yajus.

Sāyaṇa (?) characterizes the AtharvaVeda as "aihikāmuṣmikaphala" and the other three as "āmuṣmikaphalaprada" (in the introduction to the commentary on the AtharvaVeda). This distinction is obviously untenable, for the quality of aihikāmuṣmikaphalatva equally applies to the other Vedas in respect of prayers and ritual. Atharvanic elements may be found in the prayers and rites in the other Vedas. Prayer for material prosperity, happiness etc. is not new; fulfilment of desire is most often the motive behind the sacrifices.

The rites for bringing good to the sacrificer or harming his enemies are found also in so many Śrauta sacrifices. Hymns and rites for restoration of a king in the AtharvaVeda (e.g. AVŚ. 3.3. 3-5 : AVP. 2.74.3,4,7) may be compared with those in Śrauta literature, e.g. ṚV. 10.173; indrāya sutrāmṇe puroḍāśam ekādaśakapālam ... nirvaped aparuddho vāparudhyamāno vā, TS. 2.2.8.4-5. Abhicāra is not a monopoly of the AtharvaVeda; compare, for instance,

traidhātavīyena yajetābhicaran ... etayaiva yajetābhicaryamāṇaḥ, TS. 2.4.11.2-3,

brāmaṇaspatyaṃ tūparam ālabhetābhicaran, TS. 2.1.5.7,

raudrīṃ rohiṇīm ālabhetābhicaran, TS. 2.1.7.7 etc.

yo'smān (or yo asmān) dveṣṭi yaṃ ca vayaṃ dviṣmaḥ is a formula frequently used in the Śrauta rites, cf. AVŚ. 10.5.15-21, 25--35 (omits ca in yaṃ ca vayaṃ), cf. AVP. 16.129.1-10, 131.1-10. yaṃ dviṣmo yaś ca no dveṣṭi tam eṣāṃ jambhe dadhmaḥ is a magical formula at VS. 15.15-19 (cf. AVŚ. 16.6.4). The importance of the Purohita as found in the AtharvaVedic tradition may be well compared with that found in AiBr. 8.24-28 (40.1-5).

The double character of the AtharvaVeda – auspicious and terrible – reminds me of the double characteristic of Rudra – ghora and śiva: tasyaite tanuvau ghorā'nyā śivā'nyā (TS. 5.7.3.3). In Vedic religion, magic is hardly distinguished from ritual. "To appease, to bless, and to curse" – is also the motive of many other Vedic prayers

– to appease gods, to bless the sacrificer, and to curse his enemies. The difference is not much in kind, but in degree. Even the ṚgVeda knows the world of evil spirits, demons, goblins etc., also witchcraft (yātu, ulūkayātu, śuśulūkayātu, kokayātu, suparṇayātu, gṛdhrayātu, yātudhāna, etc. in 7.104.21-24). Besides, the white and black aspects of magic are not always clearly distinguished.

Mantras and/or hymns of Atharvanic character may be found even in the ṚgVeda: ṚV. 10.97 is a long hymn seen by Bhiṣaj Ātharvaṇa; this hymn is applied for treatment of the sacrificers, according to ĀśvŚrS. 6.9.1-2. ṚV. 7.55 (vss. 2-8) is a charm (cf. AVŚ. 4.5 : AVP. 4.6) for putting people to sleep. imāṃ khanāmy oṣadhim, ṚV. 10.145.1 (= AVŚ. 3.18.1 : AVP. 7.12.10) is used for sapatnīnāśana according to ĀpGS. 3.9.6. There are hymns for averting or counteracting yakṣma (ṚV. 10.163, cf. AVŚ. 2.33 : AVP. 4.7), Alakṣmī (ṚV. 10.155) or the Rakṣases in the ṚgVeda. Actually the character of mantras is not much different, they sometimes differ in application.

Internal evidence of mantras is not always a safe guide in their ritual application. There are mantras in common in the AtharvaVeda (even apart from the twentieth book) and the ṚgVeda. Comparison of their ritual application reveals that one and the same mantra occurring in the ṚgVeda and the AtharvaVeda was used differently in two different traditions – Śrauta and Atharvanic.

The magical character of the AtharvaVeda largely depends on the KauśikaSūtra. We do not know whether that was also the original intention. Even the KauśikaSūtra does not show application of all the mantras. Ritual application of AV. mantras is not always clear or beyond doubt, e.g. AVŚ. 1.34 which is taken by Whitney and Bloomfield as a spell to secure love of a woman, whereas Sāyaṇa and KauśikaSūtra (38.17) regard this as a means to win an assembly by disputation. Even ancient mantras can be adapted to comparatively new rites. This is frequently done in later practices like the pūjās. The ṚgVidhāna tells us of magical results of using ṚgVedic mantras. It shows adaptation of the old mantras of the ṚgVeda to the later or popular practices/rites. If we follow the ṚgVidhāna and if there were no other sources of knowing ritual application of the ṚgVeda, even

the ṚgVeda would have appeared as a text of magical rites like the AtharvaVeda. The SāmaVidhānaBrāhmaṇa too prescribes the application of sāmans for magical purposes.

Redaction of the Vedic Saṃhitās appears to have been made originally on the basis of Śrauta rites. Though in the case of the ṚgVeda the ritual connexion is not always clear to us, it is possible that such connexion was existing at the time or at least in the eyes of the compiler. The AtharvaVeda is separate from the three other Vedas in that it is not connected with the Śrauta rites proper, cf. atharvavedas tu yajñānupayuktaḥ śāntikapauṣṭikābhicārādikarmapratipādakatvenātyantavilakṣaṇa eva (Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, PrasthānaBheda, in Ānandāśrama-Saṃskṛta-Granthāvali 51, 2nd impression, Poona 1928, p. 3).

The AtharvaVedaSaṃhitā is a heterogeneous collection, of prakīrṇa character. It seems that the AtharvaVeda was originally conceived at the time of redaction as a collection of extra material that was not included in or did not fit in well with the three Vedas. There were later borrowings from other Vedas for establishing its connexion with Vedic ritual.

The AtharvaVeda combines magic, medicine and ritual. The non-Śrauta contents may be divided into two groups: 1. ritual (popular rites as distinguished from the Śrauta ones – a parallel stream of thought and action?), and 2. secular elements. The AtharvaVeda was very closely connected with the classical system of ĀyurVedic medicine. The recension called CāraṇaVaidya may have been, as the name suggests, more directly associated with medicine. Besides, both the ArthaŚāstra of Kauṭilya (1.3.2) and the KāmaSūtra of Vātsyāyana (7.1.49) refer to the AtharvaVeda. They may have used the AtharvaVeda as one of their sources. Kauṭilya (14.146) refers to secret means or aupaniṣada, cf. magical rites of AtharvaVeda.

The miscellaneous (prakīrṇa) character of the AtharvaVeda may be seen in many of its features. A few are mentioned below.

a) AVŚ. 16 (only fragmentally found in AVP. 18) contains prose formulas like yajus.

b) The AtharvaVeda has no real Brāhmaṇa dealing with the

AtharvaVedic ritual (the GoPathaBrāhmaṇa appears to be a late text for justifying the AtharvaVeda's supremacy and share in Vedic ritual). The Saṃhitā includes Brāhmaṇa-like passages though metres have been assigned. The AtharvaVeda contains prose pieces composed in Brāhmaṇa style; e.g. AVŚ. 8.10 : AVP. 16.133-35 (virāj), AVŚ. 9.6 : AVP. 16.111-17 (in praise of hospitality), AVŚ. 11.3 : AVP. 16.53-58 (odana), AVŚ. 12.5 : AVP. 16.140-46 (brahmagavī), AVŚ. 15 : AVP. 18.27 (Vrātya). Such/these pieces contain characteristic expressions used in Brāhmaṇa style, e.g. ya evaṃ vidvān ..., AVŚ. 9.6.40 etc. (contrast AVP. 16.114.1 etc.); ya evaṃ veda, see especially AVŚ. 9.6.62 : AVP. 16.117.5d, AVŚ. 9.7.26 : AVP. 16.139.27, AVŚ. 8.10 : AVP. 16.133.1-7; brahmavādino vadanti, AVŚ. 11.3.26 : AVP. 16.55.5, AVŚ. 15.1.8 : AVP. 18.27.8. AVŚ. 9.5 (: AVP. 16.97-100) contains mystic presentation of things as in Āraṇyakas; it is composed in Brāhmaṇa style, see especially 22-36 in praise of yo'jaṃ ... dakṣiṇājyotiṣaṃ dadāti (cf. AVP. 16.100.2-4). AVŚ. 9.6 (: AVP. 16.111-17) is a prose piece in Brāhmaṇa style in praise of hospitality. It contains also precept (vidhi), and eulogisitic passages (arthavāda): śriyaṃ ca vā eṣa saṃvidaṃ ca gṛhāṇām aśnāti yaḥ pūrvo'tither aśnāti, tasmāt pūrvo nāśnīyāt, aśitāvaty atithāv aśnīyāt, yajñasya sātmatvāya yajñasyāvicchedāya tad vratam, 36-38 (cf. AVP. 16.113.10-11). Nindārthavāda: ojaś ca ... paśavaś ca/ tāni sarvāṇy apakrāmanti brahmagavīm ādadānasya jinato brāhmaṇaṃ kṣatriyasya, AVŚ. 12.5.7-11 : AVP. 16.141.(1-5).

These pieces may be called Gṛhya Brāhmaṇa.

c) In some cases the AtharvaVeda shares characteristics of Āraṇyaka, as it shows mystic significance of rites and various objects as in an Āraṇyaka, e.g., AVŚ. 4.34 : AVP. 6.22.1-9 (brahmaudana), AVŚ. 9.5 : AVP. 16.97-100 (sacrificial goat), AVŚ. 9.7 : AVP. 16.139 (cow), AVŚ. 11.3 : AVP. 16.53-58 (odana).

d) It is possible but unlikely that the AtharvaVeda was called BrahmaVeda because of its connection with the duties of the Brahman priest. In real practice the Brahman priest's duties do not require the AtharvaVeda. According to Brāhmaṇical theory and practice, the Brahman performs his duties by means of trayī vidyā, i.e. ṛc, yajus and sāman (AiBr. 5.33 (25.8), ŚPBr. 11.5.8.7). According to ŚāṅkhBr. 6.11, a Bahvṛca should be chosen as Brahman; TS. 3.5.2.1

and SPBr. 12.6.1.41 prefer a Vāsiṣṭha for this position. It is only the GoPathaBrāhmaṇa that advocates utility of the AtharvaVeda for the duties of the Brahman.

Most probably, the AtharvaVeda is called BrahmaVeda for it deals more than the other Saṃhitās with Brahman, the Ultimate Reality according to Upaniṣad. AtharvaVeda has more philosophical matter than the other Saṃhitās. Philosophy of Brahman-Ātman of the Upaniṣads begins in the AtharvaVeda. For instance, Brahman dwells in man, god, AVŚ. 10.2.23 (with its immediately preceding similar verse, cf. AVP. 16.61.1), creates earth and atmosphere, AVŚ. 10.2.25 : AVP. 16.61.4, resides in man, AVŚ. 10.7.17 : AVP. 17.8.8. Here we probably find the poetic form of Upaniṣad's brahmavidyā, see for example AVŚ. 8.9 : AVP. 16.18-20, AVŚ. 8.10 : AVP. 16.133--35, AVŚ. 9.9,10 : AVP. 16.66-67,68-69, AVŚ. 10.2 : AVP. 16.59-62, AVŚ. 10.8 : AVP. 16.101-03, AVŚ. 11.7 : AVP. 16.82-84, etc.

Significantly, the BrahmaSūtra (2.3.43: aṃśo nānāvyapadeśād anyathā cāpi dāśakitavāditvam adhīyata eke) refers to AVP. 8.9.10 (not found at ŚaunakaSaṃhitā).

kena śrotriyam āpnoti kenemaṃ parameṣṭhinam ..., AVŚ. 10.2.20 (cf. AVP. 16.61.5), etc. remind one of keneṣitaṃ patati preṣitaṃ manaḥ etc. (KenUp. 1.1).

Many Upaniṣads are affiliated to the AtharvaVeda. But why was it so if the AtharvaVeda had no Veda-status? Is it because the AtharvaVeda lays little stress on the Śrauta rites like the Upaniṣads?

There are misconceptions that the AtharvaVeda was neglected, not accorded the Veda status for a long time, it was looked down upon, and so on. The AtharvaVeda was really not neglected; the apparent neglect in the Śrauta domain was because of its exclusion from the Śrauta domain – the AtharvaVeda gained importance when the Śrauta tradition became weak. If we view the things from a different angle, I think, the Atharvans and the Aṅgirases were not denied due recognition in ancient India, even in the corpus of Vedic literature. Even if we attach no importance to the claims made in the GoPathaBrāhmaṇa in favour of the AtharvaVeda, the testimony of the other Vedic texts will reveal that the propagators of the AtharvaVeda were regarded with veneration, not disapproval.

The AtharvaVeda, like the three other Vedas, reflects beliefs and aspirations of the same people, but it reflects probably more than the other Vedas the living condition and domestic picture of these people. What is said about the religion of the AtharvaVeda is also true to some extent about the religion of the three other Vedas, generally speaking. The circle where the AV. hymns originated was not totally different from that of the ṚgVedic or other Vedic hymns. The Atharvans and the Aṅgirases, whose names are very closely connected with the AtharvaVeda, are both known in the ṚgVeda, e.g., they are mentioned together with the Bhṛgus, who too are connected with the AtharvaVeda, in aṅgiraso naḥ pitaro navagvā atharvāṇo bhṛgavaḥ somyāsaḥ (ṚV. 10.14.6). The lists of the seers of the ṚgVedic and the AtharvaVedic hymns have names of seers in common, e.g. Jamadagni, Nārāyaṇa, Vasiṣṭha, Viśvāmitra, Śunaḥśepa, Agastya et al.

The contributions of the Atharvans and/or the Aṅgirases were not confined to the AtharvaVedic literature. Their names are recorded in connection with other Vedas as well; e.g. the ṚgVeda contains hymns seen by Ātharvaṇa and Āṅgirasa seers, e.g. Bṛhaddiva Ātharvaṇa, Bhiṣaj Ātharvaṇa, Abhīvarta Āṅgirasa, Ayāsya Āṅgirasa, Kutsa Āṅgirasa, Kṛṣṇa Āṅgirasa, Nṛmedha Āṅgirasa, Śrutakakṣa Āṅgirasa, Priyamedha Āṅgirasa, Purumedha Āṅgirasa, Sukakṣa Āṅgirasa, Bindu Āṅgirasa, Pūtadakṣa Āṅgirasa, Tiraścīra Āṅgirasa, Bṛhaspati Āṅgirasa, et al.

The Atharvans and/or the Aṅgirases were mentioned in the Vedic texts without any expression of neglect, aversion or hostility; for example, Dadhyañc Ātharvaṇa in the AitareyaBrāhmaṇa and AitareyOpaniṣad, Bṛhaddiva Ātharvaṇa in the ṚgVeda, Ghora Āṅgirasa in ChāndogyOpaniṣad, many Atharvans and Aṅgirases mentioned in the list of teachers in Vaṃśa in the BṛhadĀraṇyakOpaniṣad. Dadhyañc Ātharvaṇa (mentioned in ṚV. 1.80.16 etc.) is said to have imparted the madhuvidyā to the Aśvins (ŚPBr. 4.1.5.18, BṛhĀUp. 2.5); PVBr. 12.8.6 and GPBr. 1.5.21 describe him as an Āṅgirasa. The Pañca-VaṃśaBrāhmaṇa mentions the sāman seen by the Aṅgirases (12.9.18). It recognises the atharvans as medicine ("The sāmans seen by the Atharvans, forsooth, are medicine", 12.9.10, trans. Caland; "The Atharvans are the medicine of the Gods", 16.10.10, trans. Caland).

PVBr. 8.2.5-6 recommends the Ātharvaṇa sāman to be used as the Brahmasāman for one who desires the world of immortality. Ayāsya Āṅgirasa, Haviṣmat Āṅgirasa and Haviṣkṛt Āṅgirasa were seers of sāmans, according to PVBr. 11.8.10, 14.3.22, 20.11.3, etc.

ŚPBr. 11.5.6.7 in the context of svādhyāya includes atharvāṅgirases as texts to be studied and the scheme of the pāriplava in ŚPBr. 13.4.3.7-8 includes the atharvans and aṅgirases from which a parvan may be recited.

Nor were the Ātharvaṇas and the Āṇgirasas confined to Atharvanic rites like witchcraft or Brahmatva, as sometimes supposed. Sacrifices introduced by the Aṅgirases are also known, as – Aṅgirasām ayana, Aṅgirasāṃ dvirātra etc. (TS. 7.1.4). TS. 7.5.11.2 in the context of annahoma in the aśvamedha includes offerings to the aṅgirases after those to ṛc verses, yajuses and sāmans. Ayāsya Āṅgirasa was the Udgātṛ priest at the sacrifice of Hariścandra according to AiBr. 7.16 (33.4), the Udgātṛ at a sacrifice of the Ādityas (PVBr. 16.12.1, ŚāṅkhBr. 30.6); his udgītha is mentioned in JUBr. 2.3.1-2 (cf. ChāndUp. 1.2.12). Kṛṣṇa Āṅgirasa, according to ŚāṅkhBr. 30.9, saw the third session for the office of Brāhmaṇācchaṃsin. ŚāṅkhBr. 30.6 names Ghora Āṅgirasa as the Adhvaryu at a sacrifice of the Ādityas; according to ChāndUp. 3.17.6, he taught Kṛṣṇa Devakīputra the theory of the human life as a sacrifice.

Śunaḥśepa, originally an Āṅgirasa, was adopted by Viśvāmitra, and was recognised as a seer of some Vedic hymns. The Atharvans are said to have been recipients of gifts in the dānastuti, ṚV. 6.47.24.

If the AtharvaVeda was neglected or despised as we usually suppose, the aforesaid treatment of the Atharvans and the Aṅgirases was not expected.

Acknowledgment

I am grateful to the editor, Abhijit Ghosh, for kindly incorporating the references to the PaippalādaSaṃhitā (following Raghu Vira), which I could not do myself because of illness, as well as for some of his suggestions and encouragement.

Aspects of the Study of the Paippalāda AtharvaVedic Tradition

Arlo Griffiths

Abstract

History and state of the art of research on the Paippalāda śākhā as against those of the Śaunaka school – Tradition of the Paippalāda śākhā as it still exists in Orissa these days – Some historical questions pertaining to this tradition and textual transmissions of the Paippalāda śākhā – The medieval history of the tradition: Witzel vis-à-vis Bhattacharya – Manuscripts of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā and related texts – General comments on the methodological issues involved in editing the PaippalādaSaṃhitā – Criticism of Bhattacharya's new edition of the text – Specific examples of what a truly critical edition of that text might look like.

1. Introduction

While ancient sources are generally agreed that there existed once upon a time nine śākhās (recensions) of the AtharvaVeda, indisputable historical evidence is available to prove the existence of only two of the traditional nine: these are respectively the Śaunaka and the Paippalāda śākhās.[1]

The canon of the former, the Śaunaka śākhā, consists of an extraordinarily elaborate and diversified collection of texts, almost all of which have been published, sometimes even in more than one edition. Firstly, there is the Saṃhitā text, which was published in Germany already in 1856. In the 19th century, there further appeared editions of a Brāhmaṇa, called the GoPathaBrāhmaṇa, as well as editions of two KalpaSūtras, the Kauśika- and the VaitānaSūtra. At the end of that same century, there appeared a magnificent new edition of the Saṃhitā of the Śaunaka by the Bombay scholar Shankar Pāṇḍurang Paṇḍit, and the Saṃhitā-text was this time accompanied by an edition of the PadaPāṭha as well as the Bhāṣya written by (a pseudo-)Sāyaṇa. Paṇḍit's "Introduction", incidentally, gives a very clear idea of the state of the tradition of this śākhā, as it was still in existence in the mid-19th century in some parts of Gujarat and Maharashtra.

The early 20th century, then, saw the publication of several further ancillary texts of this recension, of which I may mention by way of example the so-called AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭas, the ŚāntiKalpa, and the Prāyaścittas. Around this same time was published Whitney's translation of the Saṃhitā of the Śaunaka recension, a translation which has remained authoritative to this very day.

In sum, scholars of the linguistic, ethnological, religious and literary history of ancient India have had at their disposal the complete canon of basic and ancillary texts of this AtharvaVedic recension for almost a century, and a substantial part of this material is available in English translation as well.

Radically different is the history and present state of research on the other, the Paippalāda śākhā. Not to mention ancillary texts, even the basic text of this recension, the PaippalādaSaṃhitā, is at present still not available in a complete and usable form. This text was discovered in the 1870's, in the form of an old birch-bark manuscript from Kashmir, written in the Śāradā script. Since extensive searches for additional manuscript material remained fruitless, this birch-bark manuscript was treated with the respect of a codex unicus, and published in a beautiful facsimile edition. It was completely transcribed, together with a preliminary and unsuccessful attempt at an edition, by Leroy Carr Barret over a period of no less than 35 years[2]: those who have studied this Kashmir manuscript, with its almost unbelievably corrupt text, which at times does not even resemble Sanskrit, will understand why Barret took so long to finish his work, and will all too readily quote Professor Paul Thieme's estimation of the Kashmir manuscript as "almost useless for philological purposes"[3]. That this is precisely the wrong attitude towards this unique manuscript I hope to demonstrate further on in this paper – but I will return below to matters of philology. For the moment, I only need to add that a brilliant discovery was made by the late Durgamohan Bhattacharyya in the 1950's: in Orissa he found a living tradition of Brahmins belonging to the Paippalāda branch of the AtharvaVeda, and acquired a number of manuscripts, in particular manuscripts of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā, with a much better preserved text than what had been found in the Kashmir manuscript. Before his untimely

death, he managed to finish an edition of the first four kāṇḍas. Since then, his son Dipak Bhattacharya has taken over the editiorial task, and 5 years ago published an edition of the first 15 kāṇḍas, which together represent about one half of the total size of the text (20 kāṇḍas).

I will return to the text of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā, and Bhattacharya's edition of it at the end of this paper, in which I will discuss several other aspects of the study of the tradition of the Paippalāda AtharvaVeda as well. I will do so in a more or less reverse chronological order: I start with a description of this śākhā's tradition, as it still exists in Orissa nowadays. Then follows a discussion of some historical questions pertaining to this tradition. This discussion, finally, will lead to a rather extended conclusion, in which I give some general comments on the methodological issues involved in editing the PaippalādaSaṃhitā, as well as specific examples of what a truly critical edition of that text might look like.

2. The presently existing tradition

I have made four fieldtrips to study the Paippalāda tradition of Orissa, one trip of 5 weeks in 1998-99, another of 6 weeks in 1999, the third of 6 months in 2000-01, and lastly my fourth trip in 2002 when I spent another 4 weeks in Orissa. Many years before, in 1983, Michael Witzel had already made a brief trip, and my fieldwork is a continuation of his findings[4] back then. We have found that AtharvaVedic Brahmins, without exception adhering to the Paippalāda śākhā, can today be found from South Orissa, in Ganjam district, all the way North up to East-Singhbhum district in the new state of Jharkhand. In between, in the coastal districts of Orissa, small settlements can be found, with concentrations around the former mini-capitals of Puri, Bhadrakh, Baripada, Kendujhar, and farther South-west around Narsinghpur. My survey list of Paippalāda villages by now runs to more than 80 localities, of which I have been able to visit, and thus confirm their actual existence, about 40 villages. (See the joint report by Witzel and Griffiths, with the assistance of Upadhyaya, on the Paippalāda-AtharvaVedin settlements published in this Volume.) Of course, I have made it my priority to start by visiting villages about which I have received

information that manuscripts might be preserved there, or that actively practicing priests – called Karmaṇyas – are living there.

The AtharvaVedic Brahmins generally live in Śāsana-type villages, earning their livelihood by cultivating the land granted to their forefathers by one or the other of the many minor kings, who have played such an important role in the history of Orissa. All are distinctly Oriya in their culture, and the worship of Jagannātha and Nṛsiṃha plays an important part in their religious lives, but I have found little remaining of the specific functions of AtharvaVeda Brahmins as royal police officers and spies, and the resulting negative reputation among adherents of the other three Vedas. Nor do the AtharvaVedins nowadays seem to have the much inferior status, in relation to the other 3 Vedas, which was described at some length by Georg Pfeffer (1975) in his ethnological study of Puri's Vedic Brahmins. Nowadays, intermarriage between AtharvaVeda grooms and brides of other Vedas is quite common.

The Orissa AtharvaVedins are spread over such a large geographical territory, that people have only a limited knowledge of settlements in distant regions, and maintain marital relations only with families in nearby villages. It will be an interesting question for further research to see whether the existing geographical groupings of the Paippalādins are also reflected in a stemmatic branching of their manuscript traditions, along the same lines.[5]

The manuscripts which can nowadays be found belong roughly to five categories, and I have by now seen such a number of manuscript collections, that I feel fairly secure in ruling out the chance that any other important texts may yet be discovered.

First, of course, there are still available a small but significant number of manuscripts of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā. I may note here that I have prepared a complete list of all the PaippalādaSaṃhitā manuscripts that have come to my attention, along with elaborate descriptions, which is to be published in Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 153 (2003).

Besides the manuscripts of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā, there are the much more common manuscripts for an apparently rather standardized collection of Upaniṣads, among which are found both classics such as the ŚvetĀśvatarOpaniṣad, and obscure late productions such as the RāmaCandraTāpanī Upaniṣad, or the Subodhinī Upaniṣad. There is also at least one work which ought not to be styled as an Upaniṣad at all, namely the Paippalāda version of the AtharvaVedic CaraṇaVyūha – known from the Śaunaka śākhā as Atharva-Veda-Pariśiṣṭa number 49 – which in the Orissa tradition is called CaraṇaVyūhOpaniṣad. A great number of such Upaniṣad manuscripts, and other Paippalāda manuscripts as well, has been collected by the Puri scholar Ramacandra Mishra, whose 1980 Poona dissertation on the AtharvaVedic Upaniṣad tradition, which also gives an edition of several unpublished late Upaniṣads, has unfortunately still not been printed.[6]

To a third category belong the very frequently found manuscripts of an anonymous Prayoga-style work called KarmaSamuccaya. It deals with the Saṃskāra rites of the Orissa Paippalādins, and has been published in 2000 from Balasore by the Oriya pandit Umakanta Panda, under the name VivāhĀdiSaṃskāraPaddhati. Much more interesting and important is a work called KarmaPañjikā, composed by Śrīdhara, of which Durgamohan Bhattacharyya already reported to have found manuscripts in the 60's, in his booklet The Fundamental Themes of the Atharvaveda (1968). This work claims to follow a lost Sūtra of Paiṭhīnasi, to which we find numerous references in other medieval works such as Hemādri's CaturVargaCintāMaṇi, and Keśava's KauśikaPaddhati. The KarmaPañjikā makes frequent references to a Paribhāṣā, which the same Keśava (and after him pseudo-Sāyaṇa in his commentary on ŚaunakaSaṃhitā 2.16) also cites a few times, as the PaiṭhīnasiParibhāṣā. This KarmaPañjikā also quotes from other important texts, which no longer survive in Orissa today, such as the GoPathaBrāhmaṇa – a text of which scholars since Willem Caland have suspected that it was originally a work belonging to the Paippalāda śākhā. It is thus regrettable that the KarmaPañjikā remains unpublished, while manuscripts for it are exceedingly rare in Orissa nowadays. I will have occasion to refer to this text again below.

As a fourth category, I mention the equally rare manuscripts which claim to give parts of the so-called ĀṅgirasaKalpa, one of the

famous 5 Kalpas of the AtharvaVeda, and the only one which cannot be found in the modern canon of the Śaunaka śākhā. If there ever existed a uniform text of the ĀṅgirasaKalpa preserved in Orissa, I have not yet been able to find it, as the 5 manuscripts at my disposal each have only partially overlapping contents.[7]

In the fifth and last place, there are the very common, entirely heterogenous manuscripts dealing with the non-Vedic pūjā rites, which in fact nowadays are the predominant concern in the religious life of Orissa's AtharvaVedic Brahmins in general, and their ritual specialists – the Karmaṇyas – in particular. But from the Vedic student's point of view, work on the KarmaPañjikā, and besides that also on the ĀṅgirasaKalpa manuscripts, should be the first focus as far as Paippalāda ancillary literature is concerned.

Such is, in brief, the situation of Paippalāda AtharvaVedic Brahmins in Orissa nowadays, and such is the corpus of texts they have preserved, among which the PaippalādaSaṃhitā is of paramount importance.

3. The medieval history of the tradition

But how is it that PaippalādaSaṃhitā, and the community which has transmitted it, have survived only in Orissa? And why is it this, and **only** this śākhā that survives in Orissa, while the Śaunaka śākhā is restricted to Western India? What, on the other hand, was the nature and origin of the tradition in Kashmir, which has left us the lone birch-bark manuscript dating to the 16th or 17th century, but has otherwise completely vanished there? What, if any, is the connection between these two, the Kashmirian and the Orissa transmissions of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā?

The importance of these questions in and of themselves, as well as for the history of the oral and written tradition of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā, was rightly emphasized by Bhattacharya, in the introduction to the 1997 first volume of his edition. Before him, these matters had already been discussed by Witzel in two articles, both published in 1985, and restated in a broader context in a review article of 1993. Bhattacharya has presented us his own historical hypothesis, which seems to have been conceived without knowledge

of the alternative and more detailed hypothesis offered by Witzel in his article on "The Atharvaveda Tradition, and the Paippalāda Saṃhitā" (see also Witzel 1993). I will now very briefly summarize first Witzel's, and then Bhattacharya's hypothesis. I will be able to present two new pieces of evidence, one of which has become available only very recently, both strengthening Witzel's ideas.

Witzel believes that the early medieval centre of both the Śaunaka and the Paippalāda traditions was located in Gujarat, where we find around the middle of the first millennium a number of land donations to AtharvaVedic Brahmins, some of which specify that these Brahmins belonged to the Paippalāda śākhā. In his article (1985a) Witzel has put forward several hypotheses, arguing on the basis of palaeographic developments that must underlie certain typical writing mistakes, as well as on the basis of the geographical assignment of certain pronunciation mistakes that occur in the manuscripts. Most important is Witzel's hypothesis that the Kashmir and Orissa traditions of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā both ultimately go back to one **written** source, an archetype manuscript, which would have been produced in Gujarat around the 9th century. Through at least one more sub-archetype, also belonging to Western India, and another copy which must have already been written in the Śāradā script, we arrive at the extant Kashmir birch-bark manuscript. The Orissa manuscripts, on the other hand, according to Witzel go back to a sub-archetype, which belonged to Eastern India, certainly not dating to before the 11th century. This sub-archetype goes back in a straight line to the main archetype from Gujarat.

Witzel believes that the Orissa Paippalāda tradition may well have arrived there from Western India, via Bengal, and points to 11th and early 12th century land-grants from Bengal which record the donation of land to adherents of this śākhā. In this connection, I am glad now to be able to enter into evidence a very recently published (see Tripathy 2000) 10th century copperplate grant from the central Orissan kingdom of Ubhayakhiñjalimaṇḍala[8], which records the donation of land to three Paippalādins. Interestingly, two of these Brahmins are reported to have migrated from Oḍra – that is the Puri area of coastal Orissa, while the third has come from South-West Bengal, Dakṣiṇa Rāḍha. This grant thus at once provides support for

Witzel's hypothesis of Paippalāda migration from Bengal into Orissa, but also proves that there were already settlements of Paippalādins in coastal Orissa in the 10th century.

Let me now discuss briefly the basic hypothesis of Bhattacharya. Without referring to Witzel's hypothesis, he states his belief that at a certain unspecified point in history, the Paippalāda śākhā has found its home in South India, and has thenceforth been disseminated to both Kashmir and Orissa. As to the origin of the Kashmirian transmission in South India, Bhattacharya adduces a passage from Jonarāja's RājaTaraṅginī. This particular passage (interpolation nr. 121, lns. 74-89: Kaul 1967, p. 173), which is part of the extensive late 16th century interpolations inserted when the text was being translated into Persian on behalf of Mughal emperor Akbar[9], speaks in rather mythological terms of an import into Kashmir of the AtharvaVeda (which **śākhā** is unclear), during the reign of Zain-ul--Abidin, from 1420 to 1470. The import is said to have been performed by the Vaidika Yuddhabhaṭṭa, who had been "taught by the Karṇāṭas". This is basically the only piece of evidence[10] provided by Bhattacharya for a link between the Kashmir Paippalāda-Saṃhitā transmission, and South India – Karnataka in particular. As for the source of the Orissa tradition, Bhattacharya simply writes in his 1997 introduction (p. xlix): "I have not yet got any evidence which goes against a southern origin of the recension".

But, as I was very surprised to discover during my recent stay in Orissa, even if the evidence from the RājaTaraṅginī for a "Karnataka"-link at least of the Kashmir transmission is reliable, the relevant word *karṇāṭa* may also be interpreted in a different light. As I noticed in Puri, the modern astrological almanacs which are being used throughout Orissa, prescribe the use in astrological calculations of the following formula referring to the regnal year of the current Gajapati king of Puri:

> śrīmad vīra śrī Gajapati Gauḍeśvara Navakoṭi Karṇāṭa--Kālavargeśvara vīrādhivīravarapratāpī śrī śrī Divyasiṃhadeva mahārājāṅka 37-38//

It turns out that this practice of referring to Gauḍa and Karṇāṭa has been followed by Puri-Rājas ever since the middle of the 15th century, coinciding with the time of the rule of Zain-ul-Abidin in Kashmir. By 1464, after conquering territories stretching from Bengal in the North, to the Kaveri in the South, including large parts of the Vijayanagara empire, which was at that period commonly referred to as Karṇāṭa, the Sūryavaṃśī ruler Kapilendradeva assumed the proud title, "Gajapati Gauḍeśvara Navakoṭi Karṇāṭa-Kālavargeśvara",[11] and his title has been used by Gajapati rulers in Orissa ever since.

Thus if we really want to take the interpolated passage in Jonarāja's RājaTaraṅginī serious as evidence for the history of the Paippalāda śākhā, the reference to a Yuddhabhaṭṭa having learnt the AtharvaVeda from the Karṇāṭas around the middle of the 15th century may quite well be interpreted as follows: Yuddhabhaṭṭa went to any part of Kapilendradeva's empire where AtharvaVedic Brahmins were settled, and thus most probably Orissa itself, the only place where we have positive evidence of Paippalāda presence continuously from at least the 10th century onwards.

Let me summarize that while aspects of the transmissional history of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā remain uncertain, it seems to me that there is no positive evidence for a role of South India at any point. And while there is not yet a clear picture of the Paippalāda-Saṃhitā transmission in Kashmir, and the reason for Yuddhabhaṭṭa's distant travels (if they ever took place) is equally unknown, it is at least certain that Paippalādins were present in both Bengal and Orissa already in the 10th century. Moreover, there seems as yet to be little reason to doubt Witzel's 1985 suggestion that the Paippalāda Brahmins came to Eastern India, taking their Saṃhitā with them, from Gujarat, in the second half of the 1st millennium.

If we want to go even further back in history, before the settlement of Paippalādins in Gujarat, we may – as has been done by Bhattacharya[12] – refer to an apparently rather specific knowledge of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā on the part of eminent North-Indian Vaiyākaraṇas all the way down from Pāṇini, through Patañjali, to the authors of the Kāśikā Vṛtti. But I will break off my discussion of the history of Paippalāda tradition here, and move on to the topic which of

course remains of paramount importance: that is the establishment of the correct text of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā, using all the manuscript and other materials which are available. Bhattacharya's edition, of which the first half (1997) has now been available for study for five years, is by any standard a major achievement, and a milestone in Vedic studies. But in the following final section of this paper, I intend to demonstrate that Bhattacharya's work, which calls itself a "**critical** edition", is far from being the last word.

4. The new edition of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā

Before I discuss a few concrete examples of where advances can be made upon the reading and presentation of this second oldest Vedic text, I would like to mention explicitly four points of criticism, which I hold against Bhattacharya's work.

The first point is that Bhattacharya, in preparing his edition, has not sufficiently availed himself of the help of text-external sources, both in primary and secondary literature, the neglect of the latter being a point which I already mentioned above.

The second point is Bhattacharya's editorial principle – a principle, incidentally, which has not been acknowledged as such in his Introduction – to basically follow the Orissa manuscripts, and consider readings from the Kashmir manuscript only when the reading of the Orissa manuscripts is evidently unacceptable. This is the classical editorial error of adopting readings for the sole reason that the manuscript from which they are taken is "the better manuscript". A critical edition weighs the readings of all available manuscripts in each individual case, and the general quality of some manuscripts is never an argument against an **at first sight** equally acceptable reading of other manuscripts.

The third point of criticism is that Bhattacharya has not been consistent in applying his editiorial principles. One might also complain that these principles are not very clearly and systematically set out in his "Introduction", but that is a different matter.

Besides these points of criticism, there is of course the plain fact that one scholar working alone cannot be expected to solve all the problems which a text as large and as corruptly transmitted as

the PaippalādaSaṃhitā poses. The editor's great merit lies in the fact that he has given us a usable text, more importantly one which has been provided with an apparently quite reliable critical apparatus, in which the reader can see for himself what variant readings are available. But – and this is my fourth point – Bhattacharya's work contains too many instances where the simple application of philological acuteness, not least of which is attention to the requirements of the metre, would have resulted in a better and more truly **critical** edition.

In order to clarify my points of criticism, I will now discuss a number of concrete examples. We shall start with a matter of textual divisions, namely the division of anuvākas in the second kāṇḍa of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā.

Both the Kashmir and the Orissa traditions of PaippalādaSaṃhitā manuscripts agree that this kāṇḍa, which contains 91 hymns, is to be divided into 18 anuvākas, with 5 hymns per anuvāka. This is where the trouble starts, because the total number of 91 hymns of course does not allow for a nice consistent splitting--up into portions, anuvākas, of 5 hymns. The two traditions have solved this problem in different ways, and I have tried to show how in the following table:

Anuvāka number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Hymns in Kashmir	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	**26-31**	32-36	37-41	42-46	47-51	52-56	57-61	62-66	67-71	72-76	77-81	82-86	87-91
Hymns in Orissa	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	66-70	71-75	76-80	81-85	**86-91**

Table: the anuvāka-division of PaippalādaSaṃhitā kāṇḍa 2 according to the Kashmir and Orissa manuscripts

The Kashmir manuscript allows for an irregular anuvāka with 6 hymns as 6th anuvāka, whereas the Orissa manuscripts postpone the irregularity to the end, and allot 6 hymns to the last, the 18th anuvāka.

Confronted with this situation Bhattacharya sticks to his usual principle by faithfully printing anuvāka-colophons where these are marked in the Orissa manuscripts, no doubt having felt that the way these manuscripts deal with the anuvāka division is not evidently worse than what is found in the Kashmir manuscript. That the Orissa manuscripts are in fact wrong, however, and that it is the Kashmirian anuvāka division which is authentic, could have been known by Bhattacharya, if he had studied the KarmaPañjikā, the probably late--medieval text which I already mentioned above, of which at least one manuscript has been in his family's possession since the 1960's.

For some months now, I have had access to a good manuscript of this text, and I have found that in its Vedādhyayanavrata-section, there are elaborate instructions, which the guru is to give the śiṣya, about the beginnings and ends of all textual divisions of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā. Thus, this KarmaPañjikā lists the pratīkas of the initial and final verses of each anuvāka in kāṇḍa 2: it completely agrees with the division as found in the Kashmir manuscript.

The conclusion thus has to be that, consciously or unconsciously, a change has been made in the Orissa manuscripts, with the result that these now place the irregularity at the end of the kāṇḍa. And this change must have affected the manuscript-transmission after the time of composition of the KarmaPañjikā, or else the teaching of the Veda at Śrīdhara's time must still have been largely independent of the manuscripts.

Although this issue of the anuvākas in the 2nd kāṇḍa nicely illustrates my objections to Bhattacharya's blind acceptance of the Orissa manuscripts, and is a good example of a missed chance to make use of evidence external to the actual manuscripts, it still has to do with a rather formal aspect of editing the PaippalādaSaṃhitā. Let me therefore move now to a few examples where the Vedic text itself has not been presented in an optimal way.

An example of editorial inconsistency is to be found in the comparison of Bhattacharya's presentation of verses 3.24.3 and 5.10.3, which he prints as follows:

pratīcī dig varuṇo'dhipatiḥ
+pṛdākū rakṣitā mitra iṣavaḥ/
tebhyo namo'dhipatibhyo namo
rakṣitṛbhyo nama iṣubhyo namo vo'stu/
yo'smān dveṣṭi yaṃ vayaṃ dviṣma-
staṃ vo jambhe dadhmastamu prāṇo jahātu// (3.24.3)

and:

siṃhaste astu taṇḍulo vyāghraḥ paryodanam/
pradākūrastu nagnahurvṛkasya hṛdi saṃ srava// (5.10.3)

The manuscript-situation is almost identical in both cases: the Orissa manuscripts have *pradākū*, with only manuscript **Ma** reading *prudākū* at 3.24.3, while Kashmir has *prajākū* in both places. The correct reading has rightly been restored as *pṛdākū* by the editor at 3.24.3, but he has not made this evident emendation in book 5, where he has instead used the editorial device of underlining. In his own words, this underlining is reserved for cases where there is "doubt of some kind, i.e. regarding authenticity, correctness etc." (p. xxxii). In my view, there can be no doubt that the correct and authentic reading at 5.10.3 is also *pṛdākū*, and this is the reading that a truly critical edition would have adopted.

Another example of a wrong decision to follow the Orissa manuscripts at the expense of a correct reading preserved in Kashmir, is to be found at 6.3.9, of which Bhattacharya's version runs as follows:

śaśvadābhiḥ śāśadānāḥ+ śamanānvayāmasi/
āpo viśvasya sūdanīryā devā manave daduḥ// (6.3.9)

In the last pāda, the editor has followed the uniform Orissa reading *daduḥ*, against the reading *dadhuḥ* found in the Kashmir manuscript. I have made a survey of all occurrences in Vedic mantra literature of the dative form *manave*, using Vishva Bandhu's Vedic Word Concordance, and it turns out that this word is never combined with a form of the verb *dā-* 'to give', whereas there are several examples (e.g. ṚgVeda 1.36.10, 8.27.21) of its combination with the verb *dhā-* 'to place'. In view of this evidence, it seems clear that it is the

Orissa manuscripts which have suffered a corruption.[13] A critical edition ought to read *dadhuḥ* with the Kashmir manuscript.

All this, by the way, is not even to mention the text which Bhattacharya accepts for the second pāda, which to me is entirely incomprehensible, and as edited moreover metrically deficient. I myself have not yet been able to find a convincing explanation or emendation for this pāda, so for the time being maintain that it should have been marked with the editorial device of an underlining.

Yet another example of a preferable reading simply available in the Kashmir manuscript is to be found at 6.8.8. According to the edition:

yasyā janitramiṣṭargā adṛṣṭāḥ kṛmayaḥ pulūṣayaḥ/

tasyai balāsapatnyai namaskṛṇomi kukṣyai// (6.8.8)

Using all four sections of Vishva Bandhu's Concordance, I have found the following facts about the word which Bhattacharya here has decided to edit as *kṛmayaḥ*, following the Orissa manuscripts. The word *kṛmi-* or *krimi-*, which means something like 'worm', is restricted in its occurrence to a few passages in Vedic mantra texts and Brāhmaṇas. Limiting our scope to the AtharvaVedic Saṃhitās only, it is clear that the authentic "AtharvaVedic" form of this word was *krimi-*. Bhattacharya in his edition is inconsistent, choosing the *krimi-*form in some other places in his edition. But he should in all cases have opted for this form, as it is nicely preserved in the Kashmir manuscript here.

The following word in this same verse reads *pulūṣayaḥ* in the Orissa manuscripts, and has been printed as such by Bhattacharya, with appropriate underlining, for the Orissa reading is certainly neither correct nor authentic. Neither is the Kashmir reading *puruṣāya*, so the critical editor finds himself confronted with a corrupt tradition, and must consider the possibility of making an emendation. In a footnote, Bhattacharya has suggested to emend to *purīṣyāḥ*, an emendation which is not supported by any of the philological evidence that I have been able to find, does not solve the metrical irregularity of the pāda, and has fortunately not been adopted into the text by Bhattacharya. Much more appealing to me, and much

closer to the transmitted manuscript readings, is the emendation *pluṣayaḥ* meaning 'fleas', which was suggested to me by Witzel a few years ago. This reading admittedly does not solve the metrical irregularity of the pāda, but such irregularities are not unknown in the AtharvaVedic mantras. I am convinced that a critical edition would be well-justified to print the text with Witzel's emendation (cf. also *adṛṣṭa- plúṣi-* at ṚgVeda 1.191.1).

Another interesting case is the printed text of verse 6.9.9:

yaṃ tubhyaṃ bhāgamṛṣabhaṃ devāḥ kevalyaṃ daduḥ/
tena vṛtrāṇi jaṅghanaṃ śatrūṃśca jahyāhave// (6.9.9)

The editor has underlined the syllable *ke*, thus informing the reader of his doubt as to the authenticity of this Orissa reading. His doubt was probably inspired by the Kashmir reading *kaivalyaṃ*. Bhattacharya has rightly not adopted that reading, because the concept of kaivalya is certainly post-Vedic. The word does not occur once in the first three sections of Vishva Bandhu's Concordance. But neither does that Concordance contain any attestation of the word *kevalya-* which is thus either corrupt, or a hapax legomenon. It is most likely a correct and authentic hapax, being a perfect example of what have been called "extended forms" in a recent Austrian thesis by Agnes Korn. These are forms, quite frequent also in the ṚgVeda, of adjectives ending in *-a*, which show variants in *-ya*, where the metre requires this (Korn 1998, 72ff.). Thus, our form *kevalyam*, which has to be pronounced *kevaliyam* to suit the metre, is a previously unattested extended form of the common adjective *kevala-*. It does not have to be printed with underlining.

The preceding examples have involved relatively minor alterations to the printed edition, and any editor of a text as large and difficult as the PaippalādaSaṃhitā may be expected to make some errors of judgment such as the ones I have up to now discussed. More serious are the editorial errors that have been committed in the two following cases, with which I will bring this paper to a close.

At PaippalādaSaṃhitā 5.37.2, we read in Bhattacharya's edition the following text:

yadyasyāḥ prajā varuṇena guṣpitā
durṇāmāno vārtvijamasyārhanti/
dveṣāt sapatnād yadi cakrurasyā
ayaṃ tā nāṣṭrā apa hantvagniḥ// (5.37.2)

Besides the fact that the form *sapatnād* in the third pāda, for which the Kashmir manuscript reads *sahapatnyād*, is probably to be emended to something like *sāpatnyād*, it is the text of the second pāda which must occupy us here. The pāda has been printed without underlining, even though the cadence is incorrect, even though the reference to an ṛtvij-priest seems completely out of context, and even though it is unclear why the 'ill-named' durṇāman-demons would be predicated with a form from the verb *arhati*. It is beyond doubt that the text as printed cannot be correct or authentic. The correct text (with triṣṭubh--cadence in a 12- or 13-syllable pāda) was found by Sacha Lubotsky, of my University, and later confirmed by me by comparing the related verse 7.11.4, which is given here as well:

yasta ūrū ārohatyasṛk te rehaṇāya kam/
āmādaḥ kravyādo ripūṃ⁺stā̃ ito nāśayāmasi// (7.11.4)

We have once again to follow the Kashmir manuscript and read *rtviyam*. The word *ṛtviya-*, meaning 'menstrual blood' (cf. Slaje 1995), is paralleled by the word *asṛk* 'blood', at 7.11.4. The deceiving Orissa reading has resulted from the very frequent Oriya confusion of the akṣaras *ja* and *ya*. Furthermore, the correct text must contain the verb form *rihanti*, which we may compare with the nominal derivative *rehaṇa-* found at 7.11.4. With that emendation, we have established the authentic text of this verse, which is another expression of the idea of a demon licking the menstrual blood of a woman to prevent her from conceiving a foetus. This idea is not only found clearly at PaippalādaSaṃhitā 7.11.4, but also at a few other places in Vedic literature (e.g. Paippalāda 7.19.5 and ṚgVeda 10.162.4).

The final point of discussion is taken from a very important hymn dealing with the production of the alcoholic surā-beverage. It is verse 8.12.11, of which Bhattacharya's edition runs as follows:

idaṃ kodacemāṃ surā yāṃ hṛdā kāmayāmahe/
tāṃ me bhagastāmaśvinā tāṃ mā baṭ sarasvatī// (8.12.11)

Let me give the correct version straight away:

*udaṅkodacemāṃ surāṃ yāṃ hṛdā kāmayāmahe/
tāṃ me bhagas tām aśvinā tāṃ ⁺ma āvaṭ sarasvatī//

The way to the establishment of this undoubtedly authentic text was first shown by a brilliant emendation, which my teachers Witzel and Lubotsky both arrived at independently. This emendation yields the beautiful etymological figure *udaṅka udaca*, 'O bucket, draw up!'. Also, the Kashmirian reading *surāṃ* has been adopted instead of the Orissa reading, where an anusvāra has been lost. In the final pāda, then, the reading printed by Bhattacharya is metrically deficient, and the occurrence of the exclamation *baṭ* is surprising, to say the least. Actually, the manuscript tradition has here preserved a case of secondary sandhi, which has prevented Bhattacharya from seeing the correct text. The pāda must evidently read *tāṃ ma āvaṭ sarasvatī*, with *tāṃ ma* through sandhi for *tāṃ me*, as found also at the beginning of the preceding verse-quarter.

In this way, a completely incomprehensible passage, with a deceptively non-underlined but entirely wrong final pāda, has been restored to a beautiful and perfectly regular Vedic verse, through the methodological application of critical philological thought.

In this paper, I hope to have indicated some major lines of ongoing research into the history and textual transmissions of the Paippalāda śākhā of the AtharvaVeda. I have laid particular stress on the critical study of the Saṃhitā of this school, a field where considerable progress still needs to be made.

Notes

[1] See the references collected by D. Bhattacharyya 1955 & 1964, Mishra 1984, and Rai 1972.

[2] Barret, 1905-40.

[3] Thieme (1935, p. 66) is quoted here rather out of context, as was done also by D. Bhattacharyya 1964, p. xi, and again by D. Bhattacharya 1997, p. xi (both omitting "almost").

[4] Cf. Witzel, 1985b.

[5] Even though Bhattacharya has suggested to me in personal communication that the Orissa manuscripts used by him belong to two separate sub--transmissions (a conclusion which I had also reached myself, and presented at

the 2nd International Vedic Workshop, Kyoto 1999), he has not hinted at this in his 1997 "Introduction".

[6] Moreover, the 2 copies of this thesis, which ought to be available at the C.A.S.S. as well as Pune University's central "Jaykar" Library, have vanished into thin air: Mishra's findings are thus unavailable to interested scholars. I have only been able to have a quick glance through Mishra's personal copy, December 2000.

[7] Cf. also the useful survey of data on this ĀṅgirasaKalpa, Bahulkar 1987.

[8] On the Bhañja-rulers of this kingdom, and their chronology, see also Das Gupta 1931 (not quoted by Tripathy 1974 or 2000).

[9] Cf. Kaul 1967, pp. 16-18.

[10] Cf. Kaul 1967, p. 42, on the limited outlook of the RājaTaraṅgiṇī: "Jonarāja belonged to a class that led sedentary life. The world for that class was limited only to the purlieus of the Kashmir Valley". The same presumably holds true for the interpolator, who moreover wrote after the facts he records were to have taken place.

In a very recent communication on the matter (see Mukherji e.a. [eds.] 2001, p. 32), Bhattacharya suggests that it is especially the epigraphical evidence adduced by him in 1997 which supports his hypothesis "that the Orissa Paippalādins had come via Andhra". I propose to take up the available epigraphical evidence in a future publication, but may here simply state that the new evidence from Orissa to my mind can hardly be interpreted as supporting Bhattacharya's Karnataka/ Andhra hypothesis.

[11] Cf. Panigrahi 1981, p. 202.

[12] See now also the brief paper by Kamaleswar Bhattacharya (2001).

[13] Note a similar case at PaippalādaSaṃhitā 6.12.3: *dadhe* in Kashmir (correctly), but (corruptly) *dade* in the Orissa mss.

Bibliography

Bahulkar, S.S.

1987: "Āṅgirasakalpa: a brief survey". Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (Poona) 68, 571-79

Barret, L.C.

1905-40: "The Kashmirian Atharva Veda", books 1 through 20. Journal of the American Oriental Society (New Haven) 26, 30, 32, 34 (F. Edgerton), 35, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 48, 47, 50, 58 – American Oriental Society vols. 9 & 18

Bhattacharya, D.

1997: The Paippalāda-Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda. Volume one. Consisting of the first fifteen Kāṇḍas. Calcutta

Bhattacharya, K.

2001: "Marginal notes on the Paippalāda-Saṃhitā". In: Mukherji e.a., eds. (q.v.), 25-32

Bhattacharyya, D.

1955: "Lights on the Paippalāda recension of the Atharvaveda". Our Heritage (Calcutta) 3, 1-14

1964: Paippalāda Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda. First Kāṇḍa. Calcutta

1968: The Fundamental Themes of the Atharvaveda (with special reference to its Paippalādasaṃhitā). Poona

1970: Paippalāda Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda. Volume two. Calcutta

Das Gupta, C.C.

1931: "Some notes on the Ādi-Bhañjas of Khijjiṅga Koṭṭa, Earlier Bhañjas of Khiñjali-Maṇḍala, Bhañjas of Bauda and Later Bhañjas of Khiñjali". Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (Poona) 12, 231-45

Kaul, S.

1967: Rājataraṅgiṇī of Jonarāja: edited with text comparative and critical annotations and an elaborate Introduction. Hoshiarpur

Korn, A.

1998: Metrik und Metrische Techniken im Ṛgveda. Graz

Mishra, R.C.

1984: "The extant AV śākhās and their area of circulation". Proceedings of All India Oriental Conference (31st session, Jaipur 1982), 207-14

Mukherji, R., Thakur, A., Bhattacharya, S. & Bhattacharya, D. (eds.)

2001: Traividyam. Vedic Studies in Memory of Durgamohan Bhattacharyya. Kolkata

Panigrahi, K.C.

1981: History of Orissa. Cuttack

Pfeffer, G.

1975: Puri's Sasandörfer: Basis einer regionalen Elite. Unpublished Habilitation thesis, Heidelberg

Rai, G.S.

1972: "Śākhās of the Atharvaveda". Purāṇa (Varanasi) 14, 58-69

Slaje, W.

1995: "*ṛtú-*, *ṛtv(i)ya-*, *ārtavá-*. Weibliche "Fertilität" im Denken vedischer Inder". Journal of the European Āyurvedic Society (Reinbek) 4, 109-48

Thieme, P.

1935: Pāṇini and the Veda: Studies in the early history of linguistic science in India. Allahabad

Tripathy, S.

1974: Inscriptions of Orissa. Vol. 6. Bhubaneswar

2000: "Orissa State Museum Copper Plate Grant of Silabhanja, Regnal Year 11". Orissa Historical Research Journal (Bhubaneswar) 45, 14-28

Witzel, M.

1985a: "Die Atharvaveda-tradition und die Paippalāda-Saṃhitā". Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft (Leipzig; Wiesbaden; Stuttgart)-Supplement 6, 256-71

1985b: "Die mündliche Tradition der Paippalādins von Orissa". Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft (München) 44 (Fel. Vol. K. Hoffmann), 259-89

1993: "Towards a history of the Brahmins". Journal of the American Oriental Society (New Haven) 113, 264-68

Colophon

This is a thoroughly revised and much improved version of a paper read in the International Seminar on "AtharvaVedic Studies", Department of Sanskrit, Jadavpur University, Calcutta, on 16.02.2001.

Studies in Individual Hymns

"Give myself to me": an Esoteric Interpretation of Paippalāda 1.6

Julieta Moleanu

Abstract

Triṣaptāḥ are the twenty one tattvas, meaning five mahābhūtas, five tanmātras, five jñānendriyaṣ, five karmendriyas and antaḥkaraṇa.

The hymn 1.6 of PaipplādaSaṃhitā (Śaunakīya 1.1) is unique of its sort, concentrating within four stanzas many characteristics of the Atharvanic hymns: guhyabhāṣā, qui pro quo, modified ṚgVedic verses, brahmodya.

Śaunakīya commences with this hymn, but Paippalāda has śaṃ no devīḥ at the beginning (AVŚ. 1.6), quoted by Patañjali (Mahā-Bhāṣya 1.1.4) as denoting AtharvaVeda. In the Vedic rituals performed nowadays, AtharvaVeda is being introduced by this pratīka. Anyway, the position of the hymn in the collection of Śaunakīya speaks about the importance which has been given to it, which might have been regarded as an auspicious opening for the Atharvanic recitation.

KauśikaSūtra (7.8, 139.10) and Sāyaṇa of Śaunakīya rubricate it as "triṣaptīya", by the second word of the first pāda. The Sūtra names it also as "pūrva" (10.1, 11.1, 12.10, 14.1, 18.19, 25.4, 32.28) and prescribes it for a number of different rites, against the common rule which prescribes a single viniyoga for one hymn. Sāyaṇa justifies its ritual employment by its being very potent (siddha mantra). Thus it is prescribed by KauśikaSūtra for: medhā-janana, brahmacāri-sampada, varcas, medical rites, to panic the enemy's elephant, strīkarmāṇi.

From the beginning we should attempt to understand what triṣaptīya (cf. AVŚ. 13.13, ṚV. 7.87) is. Sāyaṇa, rightly, although with exaggerated scrupulosity, hints that the sap of the entire hymn lies in this word and offers along many dense pages three interpretations:

(1) three and seven – sets of three and sets of seven

(2) three seven, as bahuvrīhi

(3) thrice seven, meaning twenty one: five mahābhūtas, five prāṇas, five jñānedriyas, five karmendriyas and antaḥkaraṇa.

Albrecht Weber (at Vishva Bandhu, "Vedic textuo-linguistic studies: AV 1,1,1", in Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal, Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, Hoshiarpur, March 1967, vol. 5.1, p. 20) interprets *triṣaptīya* as derived from *tri* and *sapta*, derived from the root *sap-* 'to come together, to combine', and translates: "which come together from the three (worlds)", envisaging the deities of the three spheres. Paul Thieme ("The first verse of the triṣaptīyam (AVŚ 1.1-AVP 1.6) and the beginnings of the Sanskrit linguistics", in Journal of the American Oriental Society, New Haven, July-September 1985, vol. 105.3, pp. 559-87) takes it as denoting the old name given by grammarians to the sounds of Sanskrit. In other words, he considers that "twenty-one" represents the basic sounds of Sanskrit in their abstract form, in the Ur--varṇopadeśa, i.e. the oldest linguistic science. From this hypothesis R.N. Dandekar (from unpublished lectures: information obtained by Dr. S.S. Bahulkar's courtesy) reaches the conclusion that twenty one represents the vowels a, i, u, ṛ having three euphonic grades (hrasva, dīrgha, plūta) and the vowel ḷ, plus the diphthongs e, o, ai, au with their hrasva and dīrgha forms. All these twenty one vowels are roaming around the Universe, bearing all the forms. By the occlusion of the phonic apparatus and with the help of the vowels, the consonants are produced. Hencefore the vowels lie at the foundation of the uttered speech and Vācaspati is being invoked to imbue the supplicant with their powers:

ye triṣaptāḥ paryanti viśvā rūpāṇi bibhrataḥ |
vācaspatir balā teṣāṃ tanvam adya dadhātu me || AVP. 1.6.1

(These thrice seven roaming around, bearing all forms, may Vācaspati bestow their powers, myself to me.)

paryanti, through the preposition *pari*, covers two semantical areas: 'around' – roaming around in an astral promenade, aiming towards the concentration into the subtle form of speech, and 'successively' – a succession of one after the other, like in an

acoustical parade of the mātṛkās (in front of the ṛṣi, in front of Vācaspati?).

The validity of this hypothesis will be challenged by the meaning of the next ṛcs. In our opinion, the first stanza is a brahmodya, the absconse meaning of which is to be understood from the rest of the hymn.

The second half of the verse has a different reading in Śaunakīya, tanvo adya dadhātu me, which can be understood as 'May Vācaspati bestow their powers into me', with tanvo as g.sg., or 'May Vācaspati bestow on me their powers, themselves (their bodies)', in W.D. Whitney's (Atharva-veda-saṃhitā, translated into English..., Cambridge, Massachusetts 1905) and Weber's (ibid.) interpretations, with tanvo as ac.pl. (cf. MS. 4.12.1 (179.15) tanvo 'dya; the other readings, viz. AVPD and AVPR, which present the karmapravacanīya adhi instead of the adverb adya, do not induce a meaning very different from our interpretation). The Paippalāda reading is also subjected to a double interpretation: 'May Vācaspati bestow myself into me by their power' (reading balāt eṣām, against the expected balād eṣām) and 'May Vācaspati [bestow] their powers, may he bestow myself into me'. The Paippalāda reading is more interesting and, on account of the principle lectio difficilior, the latter interpretation of the two Paippalāda readings is taken to convey the meaning besought by the ṛṣis.

The idea of tanvam adya dadhātu me (give myself to me) will be carried in the next verse, mayy eva tanvaṃ mama, conceived as a refrain of the hymn and repeated accordingly in 3d. Thus, 2d and 3d are latter added on the pattern offered by 1d. On the other hand, 2d and 3d of Śaunakīya offers an image more appropriate with the context, because mention is being made of śruta, which is found in the last ṛc. The reading is mayy evāstu mayi śrutam, in which śruta is the sacred knowledge perceived by the ṛṣis, the Veda. Paippalāda 2d and 3d do not account for the śruta of the last stanza, which is spoken of quite of a sudden.

upa na ehi vācaspate devena manasā saha |
asoṣpate ni ramaya mayy eva tanvaṃ mama || AVP. 1.6.2

(Render help, O Vācaspati, together with the divine mind. May the Lord of breath rest in my self.)

Coming back to the second stanza, upa na ehi has another lectio in Śaunakīya, punar ehi. The latter lectio is more meaningful because upa suggests the idea of assistance rendered by God to the yajamāna, being a newborn to be imbued with intelligence, being a speaker requesting velocity of speech and acuity of mind etc.

The apperception of the sounds is an intellective process and the mind is one which unifies the vākya with its corresponding vyāpaka. Hencefore Vācaspati is invoked to render help, together with the divine mind.

In the next line the reading asoṣpate ni ramaya vs. vasoṣpate ni ramaya of the Śaunakīya offers an image more integrated in the context. The Lord of breath is asked to stay still. By this deceleration of the breath, the lengthening and the strengthening of it are sought for. The rhythmic breathing, with controlled inhalations and exhalations and long retaining of the breath, is able to regulate the mind. For mind and breath are interrelated: when prāṇa enters into suṣumnā, the mind becomes quiescent and when mind is absorbed in suṣumnā, the prāṇa stops its flow. The quiescence of mind and breath are the prerequisites for the śabda, set in motion by the breath, to enter, with great effort, into suṣumnā and to work its way towards sahasrāra. (These images can fill up the blanks of the scenario proposed by the hymn.) Afterwards, the vāc should be refrained to go back to lower regions. Vācaspati is asked to fasten (ni yacchatu) the speech in the supplicant.

ihaivābhi vi tanūbhe ārtnī iva jyayā |
vācaspatir ni yacchatu mayy eva tanvaṃ mama || AVP. 1.6.3

(Here itself I stretch, like the two ends of a bow (pulled) by the string. May Vācaspati fasten in my own body.)

Sāyaṇa glosses, for ubhe, 'medhā' and 'bhaga', in order to keep up with the purport of the medhājanana. Whitney (o.c., l.c.) takes it as adjective of ārtnī. We have interpreted the ṛc in the same spirit. This martial comparison is found in RV. 10.166.3b, which is

an incantation for destroying the enemy. The annihilation is brought about on two plains, in a proper fight and in verbal dispute, the enemy being destroyed completely, yogakṣeme (cf. Latin domi et belli).

atraiva vo 'pi nahyāmy ubhe ārtnī iva jyayā |
vācaspate ni ṣedhemān yathā madadharaṃ vadān || ṚV. 10.166.3

With a ritualistic accuracy, apinahyāmi is replaced in the Śaunakīya by abhivitanu, because the former would have been uncalled for and inauspicious, bringing about the "binding of the mind" and not its broadening. In the same spirit, the image of Vācaspati pressing down the enemies is replaced by the fastening of the power of retention in the sacrificer.

The Atharvanic blood of the qui pro quo runs through the vein of magical transposition of the divine with the human. This transposition represents the essence of any mystical initiation. In upanayana the guru identifies the disciple with himself and himself with the disciple. In rājasūya a dialogue takes place between the anointed king and his son, wherein there is a change of name and position between the two, after which the right equation is reestablished. Similarly, the yajamāna has partaken of the divine quality and has been consubstantiated with his god.

Thus,

upahūto vācaspatir upāsmān vācaspatir hvayatām |
saṃ śrutena gamemahi mā śrutena vi rādhiṣi || AVŚ. 1.1.4

Paippalāda reads:

upahūto vācaspatir upahūto 'haṃ vācaspatyuḥ |
saṃ śrutena rādhiṣīya mā śrutena vi rādhiṣi || AVP. 1.6.4

(Proclaimed is Vācaspati, proclaimed is me, who belong to Vācaspati. May we be united with the Knowledge, may we not be separated from the Knowledge.)

Śruta is the Revelation, the expression of the Pure Consciousness apprehended by a perceiver of the same ontological level, and means an enlightened Consciousness.

Thus tanvam adya dadhātu me (give myself to me) means the arousing of the power which is Consciousness to its highest degree, the Supreme Consciousness.

The awakened Consciousness passes through all the tattvas which are nothing else but a part of Him. These tattvas are the evolutes of prakṛti: five mahābhūtas, five tanmātras with their connected jñānedriyas and karmendriyas plus antaḥkaraṇa. Each of these elements is dissolved into the next above it until the last element, which is ether, made manifest by sound with the help of its corresponding indriyas. The final dissolution is that of śabda into antaḥkaraṇa and this is the description which the hymn is bringing about. The absorbed state of the tattvas is that in which there is no śabda.

Triṣaptāḥ are thus the twenty one tattvas, meaning five mahābhūtas, five tanmātras, five jñānedriyas, five karmendriyas and antaḥkaraṇa. They are roaming around their assigned cakras and Vācaspati, representing the mantra-vidyā, avant la lettre, is asked to bestow their powers to the supplicant and restore him to his primordial condition, that of Pure Consciousness, which is able to perceive śruta, being on the pure ontological level.

Bibliography (with abbreviations of the titles)

AVP. = Atharvavedīyā Paippalādasaṃhitā, vol. 1 (kāṇḍas 1-15), ed. Dipak Bhattacharya, Asiatic Society, Calcutta, 1997

AVPD = Atharvavedīyā Paippalādasaṃhitā (kāṇḍa 1), ed. Durgamohan Bhattacharyya, Sanskrit College, Calcutta, 1964

AVPR = Atharvavedīyā Paippalāda-saṃhitā, vol. 1 (kāṇḍas 1-13), ed. Raghu Vira, the International Academy of Indian Culture, Lahore, 1936

AVŚ. = Atharvavedasaṃhitā (Śaunaka) with Padapāṭha and Sāyaṇa's Commentary, ed. Vishva Bandhu, vol. 1, Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, Hoshiarpur, 1960

MS. = Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, vol. 4, herausg. Leopold von Schroeder, Leipzig, 1886

ṚV. = Ṛgveda-saṃhitā with the Commentary of Sāyaṇācārya, vol. 4, ed. N.S. Sontakke and C.G. Kashikar, Vaidika Saṃśodhana Maṇḍala, Poona, 1946

A TaittirīyaBrāhmaṇa Myth and Paippalāda 5.16

Nirmala Kulkarni

Abstract

The paper attempts to show how a myth from TaittirīyaBrāhmaṇa 2.1.1.1-3 can be helpful in determining the context of Paippalāda 5.16.

Introduction

0.1 It is quite well-known that the PaippalādaSaṃhitā of the AtharvaVeda survives in two recensions (or rather transmissions):

The Kashmirian birch-bark manuscript was searched by Roth[1], reproduced by Bloomfield[2] and transliterated with emendations by Barret[3]. Raghu Vira[4] has given Devanāgarī version of Barret's edition.

The other important recension of the same Saṃhitā preserved on palm leaves was found in Orissa by Durgamohan Bhattacharyya[5], who published the first four kāṇḍas of it. The Orissa recension is very important for a Vedic scholar, because the Kashmirian Veda is "defective in extreme"[6]. Thieme condemns it as "almost useless for philological purposes".[7] Bloomfield calls it "a meaningless jumble of senseless sounds"[8], while C.R. Lanman describes it as "apapāṭhaskhalitaratnākara"[9]. Therefore, at least till the completion of the long-awaited edition of the Orissa recension, understanding of the available Kashmirian Veda is extremely difficult. One may find Barret often lamenting over the unintelligible readings. Raghu Vira's Devanāgarī version is full of question marks indicating ambiguous readings.

0.2 Durgamohan's son Dipak Bhattacharya has recently published an edition of the first fifteen kāṇḍas of the text of the Orissa recension, with a revised edition of the first four kāṇḍas[10], but unfortunately this is far from being a truly critical edition for various reasons, for which see Arlo Griffiths' paper published in this Volume. Therefore, the only way left is to utilize various methods of text-critical studies, primarily utilised in the interpretation of single

codices. Any text can be studied from two directions– textually and contextually. Both these methods are complementary to each other. The scope of textual study is more subtle and time-consuming since it is mainly based on parallel textual versions. On the other hand, the contextual study occupies a wider sphere and therefore, it is difficult to anchor similar contexts in the ocean of Sanskrit literature. The secondary aids are almost equal to none. The pseudo contexts supplied by the commentators do not many times match with that of the original hymn, though these are helpful in determining the ritual contexts and textual readings. Therefore, it is necessary sometimes to go beyond the typical method by searching the contexts in various myths and legends scattered in the literature. These are very much essential mainly in determining the context and secondarily the text. In the present paper, I am trying to show how a myth from the TaittirīyaBrāhmaṇa is helpful in determining the context of a Paippalāda hymn. The discussion is limited only to the contextual study. Textual emendations are just passing remarks. The paper is arranged as follows:

1. Paippalāda 5.16 and the difficulties encountered therein,
2. The myth of the TaittirīyaBrāhmaṇa,
3. The contextual correspondence, and
4. Observations.

Paippalāda 5.16 and the problems encountered therein

1.1 The Paippalāda hymn under discussion contains eight verses. Not a single verse of it is preserved in the Śaunakīya recension. Out of these eight verses, one verse is traceable in the VaitānaSūtra, and a hemistich in the TaittirīyaBrāhmaṇa. The KauśikaSūtra, MānavaŚrautaSūtra and the ĀpastambaŚrautaSūtra also correspond to it, but do not extend beyond a line. Moreover, all these texts are ritual texts and make use of the corresponding portion in various ritual settings. Also, as the correspondence is not of much extent, its role in the interpretation is limited. The hymn encounters the following problems:

1. Out of the eight verses, four verses are understandable with

the help of emendations suggested by Barret (and Bhattacharya). The remaining verses are unintelligible.

2. The verses seem to be unlinked to each other.

a) The first verse requests various divinities to make the sacrifice productive. To quote,

[11]dyauś cemaṃ yajñaṃ pṛthivī ca saṃ duhātāṃ
mātariśvā pavamānaḥ purastāt/
tvaṣṭā vāyuḥ saha somena vāta
imaṃ saṃ duhur anapasphurantaḥ//1//

(b) In the second verse, the poet describes that he is boiling milk in the gharma vessel for the Sun and he is requesting other gods to partake of such bright oblation.

[12]gharmaṃ tapāmi amṛtasya dhārayā
devebhyo havyaṃ paridāṃ savitre/
śukraṃ devāḥ śrutam adantu havyam
āsan juhvānam amṛtasya yonau//2//

(c) In the third verse, the poet requests Agni and Barhis to make the food eatable, sweet and energetic.

[13]udvāsayāgneḥ śṛtam akarma havyam
ā roha pṛṣṭham amṛtasya dhāma/
vānaspatyā upa barhis stṛṇīta
madhvā sam aṅktha ghṛtavat karātha//3//

Hereafter the link seems to be missing. Only it seems that the remaining portion of the hymn has something to do with the cows. In a verse Rudra is praised.

1.2 Let us now turn to the myth of the TaittirīyaBrāhmaṇa and then again shift to the unintelligible verses while comparing contents of the myth with that of the hymn.

Myth of the TaittirīyaBrāhmaṇa

2.1 TaittirīyaBrāhmaṇa 2.1.1.1-3 supplies a myth of Aṅgirases in support of a taboo against the first milk of cow after calving. It is as follows: Aṅgirases were engaged in a sacrificial sitting. The

cow supplying them milk was somehow living on the remnants of the soma plants. So they created plants by generating rain.

aṅgiraso vai satram āsata. teṣāṃ pṛśnir gharmadhug āsīt. sarjīṣeṇājīvat. te 'bruvan, kasmai nu satram āsmahe, ye 'syā oṣadhīr na janayāma iti. te divo vṛṣṭim asṛjanta. yāvantaḥ stokā avāpadyanta tāvatīr oṣadhayo 'jāyanta.

However, the Pitṛs anointed the plants with poison. She ate them and fainted. "Who has done it?", they thought. The Pitṛs said, "We want to have our share in the Agnihotra, therefore we did it". They gave them their share in the form of fat. Therefore, Adhvaryu after giving oblation wipes out the fat sticking to the sacrificial laddle for Pitṛs. They made the plants sweet.

tā jātāḥ pitaro viṣeṇālimpan//1// tāsāṃ jagdhvā rupyantīr ait. te 'bruvan ka idam ittham akar iti. vayaṃ bhāgadheyam icchamānā iti pitaro 'bruvan. ... tebhya etad bhāgadheyaṃ prāyacchan yad dhutvā nimārṣṭi. tato vai ta oṣadhīr asvadayan. ...//2//

The Aṅgirases let the calf loose towards its mother. It thought, "Let me ask for a boon". It asked, "For ten nights they should not milk my mother and take away milk that belongs to me. And I may move along with my mother till the cows are collected".

te vatsam upāvāsṛjan. idaṃ no havyaṃ pradāpayeti. so 'bravīd varaṃ vṛṇai. daśa rātrīr madarthaṃ jātaṃ dugdhaṃ na dohan. āsaṅgavaṃ mātrā saha carāṇīti.

Therefore, no one milks a cow for the first ten days. The calf moves around with its mother till evening. But Rudra will kill the calf if it crosses the limit of the agreement.

tasmād vatsaṃ jātaṃ daśa rātrīr na duhanti. āsaṅgavaṃ mātrā saha carati. vārevṛtaṃ hy asya. tasmād vatsaṃ saṃsṛṣṭadhayaṃ rudro ghātukaḥ. ati hi sandhāṃ dhayati//3//

Major features of the myth

2.2 The major features of the myth could be summarised as follows:

1. Aṅgirases were performing the Agnihotra or some kind of sacrifice which involves milking of cows. (Elsewhere in the Vedic literature "aṅgirasām ayanam" is referred to.)

2. They generated rain to create plants for the cow.

3. The Pitṛs anointed plants with poison.

4. Giving them proper share in the Agnihotra, Aṅgirases sweetened the plants.

5. The calf asked for a boon. They granted a part of milk for it.

6. But if it crosses the time limit, Rudra kills it.

Correspondence of the myth to the Paippalāda hymn

3.1 It appears to me that Paippalāda 5.16 has some relation to the myth of the TaittirīyaBrāhmaṇa. Since it does not bear exact verbal similarity, it has escaped the sight of ancient and modern scholars, either Indian or Western. In the following paragraphs I am trying to read the hymn in the background of the myth discussed above. As the form and structure of these two texts are different, one cannot look at them as exactly identical. But it seems to me that at least the context of the ambiguous hymn is made clear by the myth, furthermore by supplying some missing links.

1. As seen above, the first three verses constitute the mantras probably uttered by Aṅgirases while performing Agnihotra or a similar sacrifice. From the words gharmaṃ tapāmi and śukraṃ devāḥ adantu havyam it is beyond doubt that the verse refers to some sacrifice in which milk is offered as an oblation.

2. The verses fourth onwards are ambiguous for two reasons:

(a) They incorporate many problematic words which require necessary emendations. This is possible only when the context is clear.

(b) Secondly, these appear to be unconnected, mainly because the context is not clear. Now let us try to understand these verses one by one.

1. In the fourth verse probably the sage Aṅgiras is assuring the calf a general well-being, further granting it the boon. Possibly the verse means: "I am pacifying the evil, and anointing the pasture with nourishment, i.e. I am making the pasture full of sap. I am making the milk non-poisonous for you. You may drink a part of it, viz. pīyūṣa". The first quarter of the fourth verse reads, yopsi yakṣmaḥ śamayāmi taṃ vaḥ. Since yopsi does not make any sense, it is to be emended probably as yosti yakṣmaḥ śamayāmi taṃ vaḥ. Moreover, constructions beginning with yo [']sti are not new to Vedic literature. In the ṚgVeda we come across verses like yosti yādvaḥ paśuḥ (8.1.31) or yosti śmaśruṣu sthitaḥ (8.33.6). The next quarter ūrjaṃ gavyūtiṃ samanajmy etam also needs slight emendation, i.e. changing ūrjam to ūrjā, meaning thereby 'with nourishment' (see now Bhattacharya: 393). Three words from the second half are still unintelligible: taṃ na krim. In the sentence kṣīram aviṣaṃ naḥ kṛṇomi, naḥ could be replaced by vaḥ (see o.c., 1.c.). The next line clearly shows its link with the myth under discussion: aṃśaṃ tayanto pīyūṣam etat. The words aṃśam (meaning 'part') and pīyūṣam are important. The word *pīyūṣa-* means 'the first milk of a cow after calving'. The word continues in the same sense in later Sanskrit literature. The taboo expressed regarding the same by the TaittirīyaBrāhmaṇa is also expressed in texts like ManuSmṛti[14]. If the word tayanto meaning nothing is emended to dhayantu meaning 'may you drink', the complete line may mean 'may you drink a part of it, i.e. pīyūṣa'.

2. Even the fifth verse is probably addressed to calves, as it contains words like payo dhayantu and yo gopā rakṣatu vāyur enān. Vāyu is the presiding deity of calves. In Darśapūrṇamāsa sacrifice, while taking away calves from the cow, the verse vāyavas stha etc. (KāṭhakaSaṃhitā 1.1, etc.) is uttered. May be the blessing of sage Aṅgiras further continues. The verse runs as follows:

iḍānāṃ pītā uta pitryāṇāṃ
payo dhayantv ahṛṇīyamānāḥ/
ṛtubhiḥ sasyam uta kḷptam astu
yo gopā rakṣatu vāyur enam//5//

Here, the phrase iḍānāṃ pītā uta pitryāṇām is not clear to me. The translation of the remaining portion would be, 'May you drink milk

unagitated. May crop grow in accordance with the seasons. May wind, protector of these calves, guard them'.

3. The sixth verse remains obscure. It continues the same thought, i.e. well-being of calves in the first line and requests all gods to enjoy partaking their share in the Vaiśvadeva Agni.

pibata ghṛtam uta dhāvayeta
guhā uta nihitaṃ mānuṣeṣu/
viśve devā vaiśvadevasy āgnau
yathābhāgaṃ haviṣo mādayadhvam//6//

4. The seventh verse runs as follows:

yo devānām asi śreṣṭho rudras tanticaro vṛṣā/
ariṣṭā asmākaṃ vīrā etad astu hutaṃ tava//7//

It occurs with minor variations in TaittirīyaBrāhmaṇa 3.3.2, MānavaŚrautaSūtra 1.3.4.3 and MānavaGṛhyaSūtra 2.2.19. To translate: 'You are the superior god Rudra to other gods, you are vigorously moving in the row of calves. May our children be unhurt. This is an oblation for you'.

5. In the eighth verse the poet is requesting Agni to strengthen his cow-pen with the cooperation of all gods, to make it full with cowdung, with hundreds and thousands of cows. Except the first word the emendation and interpretation are not difficult. Barret has emended the verse as:

pūrṇam ahaṃ karīṣiṇaṃ śatavantaṃ sahasriṇam/
viśvebhiḥ agne devaiḥ imaṃ goṣṭomaṃ dṛṃha//8//

He remarks, "This stanza as emended is not satisfactory, I have tried to bring it into the general sphere of the first six stanzas, but that may be a mistaken effort". AtharvaVeda Śaunaka 3.14 used in gopuṣṭikarman reads the initial portion as śaṃ vo goṣṭhena etc. With its help we may read the last line of our hymn as imaṃ goṣṭham ā dṛṃha instead of imaṃ goṣṭomaṃ dṛṃha. Or, one may interpret the word *goṣṭoma-* as 'praise of cattle'. May be the poet is requesting gods to make his poem popular, firm, everlasting.

Observations

4.1 1. Though the hymn 5.16 of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā appears inconsistent and ambiguous, the myth of Aṅgirases occurring in the TaittirīyaBrāhmaṇa helps to read it in its proper context. If one reads the hymn independent of the myth, the key-verse expressing a boon given to the calves remains obscure. The myth unveils the context and helps proper emendations.

2. It is possible that Paippalāda 5.16 is a hymn similar to that of gopuṣṭikarman. Since the myth of the Aṅgirases is conducive to the praise of the cows, the poet incidentally narrates the story and thereby he is requesting Agni, Rudra and Viśvedevas to protect his herd and lastly, wishes himself to be abundant in cows.

3. If one tries to search for variations of this particular myth in Indian literature, even the remaining obscure part of the hymn may be clear. Similarly, its comparison to hymns used in the rites of gopuṣṭikarman may also be fruitful.

4. One may also generalise that myths of Aṅgirases scattered in the Vedic and Purāṇic literatures could be made useful in the interpretation of AtharvaVeda in general and of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā in particular, because, certainly the AtharvaVeda is a product of the Aṅgirases.

Notes

[1] R. Roth (1875), Der Atharvaveda in Kaschmir, Berlin.

[2] M. Bloomfield and R. Garbe (1901) reproduced it by chromophotography, Baltimore.

[3] L.C. Barret (1905-40), mainly in the Journal of American Oriental Society, New Haven.

[4] Raghu Vira (1936, 1940, 1942), Atharvaveda of the Paippalādas, Lahore.

[5] Durgamohan Bhattacharyya (1964, 1970), Paippalāda Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda, 2 vols., Sanskrit College, Calcutta.

[6] Bhattacharyya (1964), Introduction, p. xi.

[7] Paul Thieme (1935), Pāṇini and the Veda, Allahabad, p. 36.

[8] JAOS., vol. 29, p. 66.

[9] See Introduction to W.W. Whitney's English translation of the Atharva-

-veda-saṃhitā, vol. 1, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard Oriental Series vol. 7, p. lxxxiii.

[10] Dipak Bhattacharya (1997), The Paippalāda-saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda, vol. 1, Asiatic Society, Calcutta.

[11] Cf. ĀpastambaŚrautaSūtra 1.12.17, MānavaŚrautaSūtra 1.1.3.25, Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa 3.7.4.15.

[12] Cf. VaitānaSūtra 14.1, GoPathaBrāhmaṇa 2.2.6.

[13] Cf. KauśikaSūtra 2.37.

[14] It reads in a verse (5.6): gavyaṃ ca peyūṣaṃ prayatnena vivarjayet. For go-pīyūṣa see also 5.8: anirdaśāyā goḥ kṣīram etc.

Literature

See the works cited in the Notes.

Acknowledgment

I am very much thankful to Abhijit Ghosh for his valuable suggestions.

Colophon

The paper was read on 25.09.2000 in a Seminar on "The Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa" organised by the Vaidik Samshodhan Mandal, Pune.

Philosophical Problems of the Hymn to Time

(Kālasūkta: AtharvaVeda Śaunaka 19.53, Paippalāda 11.8)

Klaus Mylius

(Translated from German: Debabrata Chakrabarti)

Abstract

A thorough philosophical appreciation of the AtharvaVedic Kālasūkta.

When did philosophical thoughts start in ancient India? It is true that Indologists and philosophers have provided heaps of materials in unraveling the point in question, but no decisive clarification has been possible so far. In the present observation we like to set out from the proposition that philosophy wants to clarify the relation of man to this world from a rational point of view. Helmuth von Glasenapp's comment on its essential abstraction is striking: "All philosophical thoughts begin with an attempt to drive the unending abundance of appearances towards a limited number of things."[1]

In view of the difficulty and complexity of these problems the necessity of putting up an analysis of **all** relevant texts of the primary literature in their relevant contexts has, however, been felt considerably. We see that the "Hymn to Time" of the AtharvaVeda has not been explored from its philosophical purviews. Even the writer of this article does not dare to take upon himself the task of decisive investigations; he rather restricts himself to the fringe of contents and methodology to hand it over to the coming generation, so that they feel inspired and take up research on the subject.[2]

In the eleventh book of his "Confessions" Augustinus raises a question: "Quid est ergo tempus?" — "What is then the definition of time?" To give a reply to this question it is better to go closer to the point in the following way.[3] To begin with, we can say that Dietmar Köveker and Andreas Niederberger emphasize in the introduction to their edition of texts of French Time-philosophy of the 20th century[4] that the statement "Time is always current" is wrong: "Since the time of Bergson, philosophers (indicating French Time-philosophers, author) are in agreement that time cannot be restricted to what we

call it "current" or to its sense of the present time; because how could then its virtual reciprocal, i.e. the past and future, emerge?" Just as time has the past, present and the future in its own grip, the infinite as well is in its own possession. Not entirely. It has a speific impression of the infinite. Friedrich Engels has mentioned: "Eternity in time ... passes from the beginning in the way ... that it sees **no** end on the either side, whether in the front or back, up or down, or to the right or left. This infinite is quite different from the unending series of sequences, because it always begins with One, and obviously in the first instance."[5] "Just as in mathematics one advances from the definite to the finite in order to find out indefinite and infinite, it is the whole of the mathematical sequences, positive or negative, that begins with One, failing which nobody can find out proper calculation."[6] Dialectician Engels is of the opinion that, "The infinite **is** contradictory and full of contradictions. It raises controversies in such a way that the infinite cannot be put together according to the finite. But however unlikely, it is simultaneously undeniable."[7] Engels, however, comes to consider later in making an important segregation of the **Concept of Time** and **Real Time**.[8] It is clear today that the flowing off of time is not the time itself; it is more an aggregate of sequences. The time as such has no dimension, but it attains to the infinite through these sequences. One should differentiate the time itself with its ways of appearances, viz. the past, present and the future.

That the philosophy of ancient India arrived at this realization is not well known. It was known to Kumārila that the nature of time was different from what it appeared to be. In ŚlokaVārttika 303 it was ascertained that time was one and endless and that it appeared to be segregated and multifaceted in the past, present and future.

At the end of this leading observation on the status of time we cannot help admitting that this conception is independent of any kind of recognition from the human world and human consciousness. Only a geological process tempts Maurice Merleau-Ponty to comment in his thesis: "Time is, therefore, no real process, no actual consequence ... it has its sources in **my own** relation to things"[9] leading to absurdity.

In view of the above observations individual verses of the hymn AtharvaVeda Śaunaka 19.53 (= Paippalāda 11.8) may be examined with reference to their contents and force of expression. In order to verify them the English translations have been prefixed each time.

1. Time goes ahead like a steed with seven reins. It is thousand-eyed and is unaltered by age; it is rich in sperms. Enlightened seers mount it; its wheels are, in fact, the whole gamut of beings.

The first verse takes in remarkable philosophical assertions. It reflects the immanence of Time: Time "goes ahead"; it is considered to be a moving principle, as the **vis motrix**; "rich in sperms" is at the same time creative.[10] The word "thousand-eyed" means that time sees the world from all sides. Added information is that its status has been considered correlated.

2. Time goes ahead with seven wheels; seven are its hubs; immortality is its own axis. Time takes in all beings. Time goes ahead as the first God.[11]

The number "seven" has the expression that Time is "all". Immortality is its axis and it is endless. The dialectic confirms that inspite of turning to all beings it also turns aside. Denoting itself as the first God it indicates its own transcendence. It is the principle of the motion of creation, but being its first principle it is uncreated.

3. A full vessel is laid on Time; we see it absolutely in its manifold existence. It turns to all beings; one specifies it as Kāla in the highest heaven.[12]

To speak the truth, immanence and transcendence reach here a synthesis. Dialectic is highlighted.

4. Time brought all beings together; it encompassed all beings. It being the father became the son. There is no higher force than Time.

The basic concept of verse no. 3 has been elaborated here. Time brings all beings together and at the same time encompasses all beings. The presence of dialectic shows it again both as father **and**

son, i.e. it is outside the comprehensive world or transcendental and inside the comprehensive world or immanent.

5. Time begot that heaven. It also begot this earth. What has already become and what has to emerge, spreads out, prompted by time.

The almighty Time ascertains past, present (deixis in connection with that heaven and this earth) and future through its actions.

6. Time created this earth; the sun glows inside the realm of Time. All beings are to be had in Time; eyes catch sight of where there is Time.

Here time and light and in certain respects sight have been brought together. Time has become the "glade" of existence.

The concept of Time as creator has been extended in the following hymn, AtharvaVeda Śaunaka 19.54, Paippalāda 11.9. There the verses 1-2 serve as examples:

Water emerged from Time. Bráhman (became manifest) in the realm of Time. Divine fervours came out from the heaven's direction. The sun ascends through Time. It sinks again in the realm of Time. — Wind blows through Time; the earth (has) grown through Time. The great heaven (is) established in Time.

7. The mind is set in Time, breath merges in Time; name joins Time. All creatures rejoice when Time arrives.

This verse gives us the substance: Time appears as the rudiment of existence to which breath is linked as a vital principle of life; the same is also the fundamental of knowledge in relation to mind.

8. Divine fervours recline in Time, the best is in the realm of Time, Bráhman is connected with Time. Time, the Father of Prajāpati, is the Lord above all.

A mythical form of Prajāpati has been substantiated here. This representation is possibly a later supplement, evidently in the same way as the reply "Prajāpati" in verse 10 of the interrogation hymn RgVeda 10.121. In this regard it is worth mentioning, being as well

an observation of Jean-François Lyotard, that: "Right from the beginning men make use of a specific medium, characteristic of the restrain of time, and that is: mythical narration."[13] The significance of time as model of the "best" and its connection with Bráhman can be considered here as the concept of an axiological dimension of time. The connection of Kāla with Bráhman lacks however thorough investigations.

9. Sent by Time and begotten by Time (all) these lay their foundations on it. Since Kāla became Bráhman, the Highest Lord it supports.

The association of Time and Bráhman is here identically expounded.

10. Time created all creatures; it (created) Prajāpati in the beginning. Kaśyapa emerged from Time into being; divine fervours were born of Time.[14]

In view of the philosophical assertions a mythological observation is linked up here also as a so-called appendix. The relation of Bráhman to Prajāpati reflected in the first contours prompted Walter Ruben to say the following: "The cosmogony of the Brāhmaṇas can be divided into two types. The first one begins with the creation of the world with a God. The God is ... a new God, "the Lord of Beings", Prajāpati, a demiurgus or godly architecht, created obviously by priests. ... But a few of these Brāhmaṇas later ... went further to highlight ... their Brāhmaṇya-charisma, that bráhman was there in the beginning of creation and performed the activities of creation in lieu of a God."[15]

If we make a substance of what we have narrated before, we would not even hesitate to declare that Lucian Scherman was right in heading our text with philosophical hymn, and not with mythological hymn.[16] This interpretation was, as a matter of fact, so long undisputed. But a weighty dissentient voice came from Walter Ruben, whom we want to quote here now: "Philosophizing things or formulating a sort of ground rules for the last abstraction i.e. unmasking of the mythological, magical and available thought processes, resulted in only a few hundred years later, when a class society got educated ... to raise a trend of reciprocal polemics. It is

quite evident that in the RV and in the AV there is in no way a scope for such polemics. ...".[17]

These words have their connection with opposing philosophical standpoints of Uddālaka Āruṇi and Yājñavalkya in the Chāndogya and BṛhadĀraṇyaka Upaniṣads as well. They are so appropriate in their context that they can claim their validity in the field of epistemology where the relation of the mind to matter, of thought to being builds an undisputed central problem.

Furthermore an important thesis of Ruben deserves our reference; it deals with the connection between philosophy and polemics: "No science or philosophy is possible ... without polemics. When somebody tries to initiate philosophy in any context, he should carefully invite polemics".[18]

Evaluating polemics as criterion for philosophical thoughts, one cannot help ascertaining that the Indian intellectual life of the oldest days known to us might have offered polemics considerably. The famous hymn ṚgVeda 10.129 abounds in polemics; even the interrogative hymn ṚgVeda 10.121 ("Who is the God whom we should offer oblation?") is one of the usual viewpoints of polemics. Therefore, concerning our "Hymn to Time", we cannot ex silentio conclude that there were no polemics with it at all! If Ruben thus locates the beginning of the Indian philosophy in the oldest Upaniṣads — and it should be said in recapitulation —, then a postulate is likely to claim its validity in the field of epistemology.

We shall emphasize on the difference between philosophical ideas and philosophical systems. A micro-system can elicit the identity of the oldest Upaniṣads and Jainism, but developed systems only appear first in the **darśanas**. Since in the ṚgVeda philosophical (not only cosmogonical) **ideas** have already been reflected, contemplations over sat and a-sat in 10.129 cannot be denied seriously. The conclusion reached in 10.129.6 showing Gods themselves to be creatures, goes beyond restrictions of the thoughts arrested in mythology.

Summing up the facts already stated above we are able to confirm that the AtharvaVedic "Hymn to Time" has crossed the

border of mythology and swept wide. Mythology takes the form of the character of an (later) addition or a concession of the "spirit of the age", where it makes its appearance at last. In all the fundamental depositions AtharvaVeda Śaunaka 19.53=Paippalāda 11.8 has its philosophical character. The hymn is an impressive and admirable effort that explains the phenomena in a rational way. Their principal themes are immanence and transcendence, the function of time being the foundation of being and knowledge. The West has taken almost three thousand years — in another direction, however, — to scale the height anew — the height that was reached by the AtharvaVedic thinkers of that time and this mere statement can stimulate the interest of the younger generation studying Indology or philosophy in order to gain strength for a common research on philosophical thoughts for the time to come.

Notes

[1] Glasenapp, H. von: Die Philosophie der Inder (Stuttgart 1949), pp. 26-27.

[2] In this connection the author reiterates his cordial and collegial thanks to Dr. Lars Göhler (Leipzig) and Alexander Fidora, M.A. (Frankfurt am Main) for their valuable suggestions.

[3] For further in-depth study is referred to— Mittelstaedt, P.: Der Zeitbegriff in der Physik. Physikalische und philosophische Untersuchungen zum Zeitbegriff in der klassischen und in der relativistischen Physik (Mannheim 1976).

[4] Köveker, D. und Niederberger, A. (ed.): ChronoLogie. Texte zur französischen Zeitphilosophie des 20. Jahrhunderts (Darmstadt 2000).

[5] Engels, F.: Herrn Eugen Dührings Umwälzung der Wissenschaft (Berlin 1952), p. 58.

[6] Ibid., p. 60.

[7] Ibid., pp. 60-61.

[8] Ibid., p. 61.

[9] Merleau-Ponty, M.: Phénoménologie de la Perception (Paris 1945), German by Rudolf Boehm (Berlin 1966), quoted following Köveker/Niederberger (see note 4), p. 78.

[10] Later the thought was given a new dimension: in Bhartṛhari's Kāla-Samuddeśa, where diversity was aptly displayed as the product of time.

[11] īyate according to E. Leumann "wird angefleht"; according to J. Muir "moves onward" is to be preferred. arvák and pratyák are to be retained in reading.

[12] tam could as well have its connection with kāla a n d kumbha; Muir relates it with kāla, J. Grill and Leumann with kumbha. According to A. Ludwig kumbha is here the sun.

[13] Lyotard, J.-F.: L'Inhumaine. Causeries sur le temps (Paris 1988), quoted following Köveker/Niederberger (see note 4), p. 209.

[14] Kaśyapa is a deity side by side or identical with Prajāpati.

[15] Ruben, W.: Einführung in die Indienkunde (Berlin 1954), p. 117.

[16] Scherman, L.: Philosophische Hymnen aus der Rig- und Atharva-Veda--Sanhitâ verglichen mit den Philosophemen der älteren Upanishad's (Straßburg 1887), printed in: Lucian Scherman, Kleine Schriften (= Glasenapp-Stiftung, vol. 40), edited by F. Wilhelm (Stuttgart 2001).

[17] Ruben, W.: Geschichte der Indischen Philosophie (Berlin 1954), pp. 65-66.

[18] Ruben, W.: Einführung in die Indienkunde (Berlin 1954), p. 118.

Translator's note

I have translated the mantras (AtharvaVeda Śaunaka 19.53, 54.1-2=Paippalāda 11.8, 9.1-2) myself from the Vedic original in order to avoid retranslation (i.e. Sanskrit-German by the author and then German-English by the translator). In doing this, however, I all along tried to keep a close eye to the German synonyms and meanings of words rendered and highlighted by the author. The names of the original books referred to by the author in the Notes section have, however, been kept intact, and their English translations have been avoided. This was due to the absence of information whether they were published in English as well.

Editor's note

The author has kindly allowed the editor to incorporate the corresponding numbers of the mantras of the Paippalāda version (after Bhattacharya 1997) in brackets along with the Śaunaka version given by him.

Mythology, Religion and Philosophy

Indra versus Ṛṣabha in the AtharvaVeda

(on the basis of Śaunaka and Paippalāda recensions)

Satya Pal Narang

Abstract

In this too bold paper the author deals with the theme of the conflict and ultimate reconciliation of Indra with Ṛṣabha or Vṛṣabha, who later emerged as Ṛṣabhadeva, the first Tīrthaṅkara of the Jain religion. In doing so he has also discussed about the Paṇis and the Vrātyas.

Abbreviations

AVP. = AtharvaVeda (Paippalāda)
AVŚ. = AtharvaVeda (Śaunaka)
ṚV. = ṚgVeda
SV. = SāmaVeda

Introduction

It is possible that originally the school of Paippalāda belonged to Kashmir from which it might have migrated to Sialkot, a seat of Vedic learning, like the ṚgVeda which migrated from Bāṣkala to Śākala i.e. Sialkot. It was perhaps at Sialkot that the nomenclature Śaunaka (a satirical name) was given to the original recension of the AtharvaVeda by the Paippalādas. The Śaunakas in reciprocation gave the Paippalādins the satirical name Aśvatara (e.g. in the ŚvetĀśvatar-Opaniṣad). The migration of Paippalāda to Multan, Mount Ābu (Arbudi and Nyarbudi[0]) and later to Orissa cannot be ruled out due to various reasons of contents and language. The impact of the Ṛṣabha cult whose seat might have been at mount Ābu contributed to the theme of Triṣandhi in the Śaunaka recension which became popular vis-à-vis the less popular old recension of the AtharvaVeda. It is to be investigated in the light of inter-se relation of the recensions and their contents, particularly the regional linguistic features.

Enemies of Indra: Ṛṣabha or Vṛṣabha

There is a number of mythological allusions related to Indra, which are interpreted as natural, social, historical and anthropological; these begin from the ṚgVeda and have taken a number of shapes

in the other Vedas and in later literature. There is a number of enemies of Indra, viz. Vṛtra, Śambara etc., who represent either a natural phenomenon or the society; this is recognized, including the allusions, long back in Yāska's Nirukta and in the BṛhadDevatā of Śaunaka. One of the enemies of Indra is Ṛṣabha or Vṛṣabha, on whom the focus of the authors of mythology is shed less. A question is: Has Ṛṣabha accepted as the first Tīrthaṅkara any relation to the Ṛṣabha found in the Vedic literature, particularly in the AtharvaVeda?

A number of interpretations is given by Sāyaṇa, including the sacrificial, mystic, ĀyurVedic and grammatical, regarding the meaning and sphere of Ṛṣabha whose scattered clues are found in the ṚgVeda and in Yāska's Nirukta and the MahāBhāṣya by Patañjali. These stories are, although not clear in the later literature, have a regular concern with various territories of India where the expansion of Indra's regime, which was originally limited to the area of Saptasindhu, is visible. It appears that against this expansion a number of enemies of Indra from various regions is found, who did not agree with the attitudes and behaviour of his policies and social habits.

The Paṇi-sūkta

This conflict is clearly visible in the ṚgVeda in the Paṇi-sūkta where the arguments of Paṇis against the policies of Indra are presented by Saramā. The arguments against Indra consist of killing of cows vs. non-violence, agriculture vs. non-agriculture, and faith vs. non-faith. Slowly in the AtharvaVeda, the Paṇis, the cows and the other issues highlighted in the ṚgVeda remained in memory and there was a reconciliation of Ṛṣabha and Indra to the extent that Indra had been identified with Vṛṣabha and compared with Vṛṣa. Ṛṣabha attained the position of a great deity, thousandfold (sahasra), and was allegorically identified with the great deities of Vedic mythology.

Indra and Paṇis in memory

The AtharvaVeda continues the fight of Indra and Paṇis only in memory and almost all the features of the ṚgVeda are reflected in this memory. Let Indra, like an eagle, fall on those traders (viḍ)

who are just like wolves (sālāvṛka)[1], and various deities tried to train them in a number of ways[2]. AVŚ. 3.3.2[3] hints at the Vrātyas who are called Gāyatrīpatita in the Smṛtis. But in the cotext of 3.3.3 where the word *viḍ-* is used, they should convey the same sense. Hence Vrātyas are mixed up with the Paṇis of the ṚgVeda.

The original issue of the obstruction of the waters in the ṚgVeda, which was related to Vṛtra, shifted to Sindhu (Indus area?) from Saptasindhu in the AtharvaVeda (4.24), blended with the obstructing of the power of Dānavas acquiring the cow[4], inspiration by the ṛṣis (Aṅgirases?), breaking the māyā of the Asuras and winning of the Paṇis by Agni[5] (or the followers of Agni=Bhṛgvaṅgirases who brought the Agni from the firmament on the earth), killing of the Śuṣṇa by the thunderbolt (vadhatra) and hence getting the cows[6]. (Is Śuṣṇa a Vrātya who went to the South (infra) as Paṇis migrated elsewhere in the ṚgVeda? Did the Vrātyas and Paṇis belong to the same place (Sindhu) or were identical with minor differences in habits which were mixed up in the AtharvaVeda?)

Division of wealth of Paṇis is another activity of Indra which is preserved in memory in the AtharvaVeda[7]. It appears that both Bṛhaspati who was an alliance in triṣandhi, and Vṛṣṇa (Vṛṣabha who got the status equal to that of Indra later), were jointly given the regime. Bṛhaspati's conflict with Vṛṣabha is also preserved in stories. These Paṇis did not give tax or ransom to Indra. It is heard only through learned tradition preserved by Aṅgirases which is expressed by past perfect.[8]

ṛṣabha- and its meanings

Root *vṛṣ-*: In the AtharvaVeda, the word is used in the sense 'to pour down', e.g. pouring of the soma in sacrifice, which is accepted by Whitney with the prefix *ā-*. But immediately it took its limited meaning 'to pour the seed for pregnancy', which is available for the words *vṛṣṇa-*, *vṛṣaṇa-*, *vṛṣabha-*, *ṛṣabha-*, *vṛṣa-*, *vṛṣan-*[9]. It is very interesting that its meaning 'bull' is available in kāṇḍas 3, 4, 9, 18 and 20, vis-à-vis its meaning 'pourer' in kāṇḍas 7, 9, 16, 18 and 20. That is, the meanings 'bull' and 'pourer' both are available in kāṇḍas 9, 18 and 20 only.

Bull/ox: The words for 'bull' used in the AtharvaVeda are *anaḍvant-*, *ṛṣabha-*, *vṛṣa-* and *vṛṣṇa-* which are used, directly or in the form of similes, for the expressions 'father of calves', 'husband of cows' with curly horns (tigmaśṛṅga), 'weeping in the groups', 'having relation with cows', 'bull of the firmament', 'an aquatic, golden-horn'.[10]

Mighty: Transference of these words occurred when all these words and some new other words expressed the meaning 'power or might including heroism; manly power & animal power'.

Words used as adjectives of deities like Indra, Bṛhaspati, Oṣadhi, Sindhu and horses are *vṛṣa-*, *vṛṣabha-*, *vṛṣaṇa-*, *vṛṣatvan-*, *vṛṣan-*, *vṛṣṇi-* etc.[11]

A few other meanings have been discussed above under the head Indra and Paṇis in memory.

Indra as warrior and conqueror of wealth

Indra had been recognized as a collector of wealth (dhanañjaya) together with Aryaman, Pūṣan. Bṛhaspati, Prajāpati, Savitṛ, Soma and Agni.[12] Elsewhere, many of these deities are in confederacy with Indra (triṣandhi) to win over the enemy of the project. The acquiring of the cows with the help of Varuṇa, Atharvan and Bṛhaspati is also alluded to[13], which changed the story of the killing of Vṛtra by Bṛhaspati through his vāgvajra.

Vṛtra-killing project

All the deities had a confederacy to kill the Asura, which was called triṣandhi (the alliance of the three deities) in the AtharvaVeda.[14] This alliance was to kill Vṛtra.[15] This was among Indra, Brahman and Bṛhaspati[16], to which assistance was given by the ṛṣi Aṅgiras[17]. (Was Aṅgiras an inhabitant of Sindh, who assisted an intruder Indra?) This assistance to kill the enemy is found in repetition.[18] The author of the mantra is Bhṛgvaṅgiras who records this assistance in memory and supports the fact that the confederacy was that of Jātavedas (Agni), Ādityas and Indra.[19] (Was it a confederacy of the followers of Agni and of the Sun and Indra against the followers of the cows (Paśupati or Vṛṣabha or Ṛṣabha), who might have been

Paṇis, the protectors of cows against the Aṅgirases who killed and devoured cows?)

Other deities equally contributed to this conflict. Not only their participation, but their specific functions also, like throwing the arrows, physically killing, destroying the weapons and leading the army, are attributed to Vāyu, Indra, Āditya and Candramas respectively.[20] Mitra and Varuṇa are equally assistants in the confederacy.[21] Thus Indra emerged as a victor and the Asura was killed. But slowly the purohitas got the dominance.[22] This conflict was the main project of Indra which he won with difficulty and which opened his route for the invasion to Central India, particularly to the area of Sindh and Mount Ābu, where the followers of a number of religions and economic resources, particularly the cows, were the inhabitants, and a cultural conflict became the main issue.

Violence vs. non-violence: the main issue

The sacrifice of the ox (ṛṣabha) has been alluded to in the AtharvaVeda and a person who makes the sacrifice attains the fruit of one thousand sacrifices.[23] In a prayer to Bhava and Śarva (Bhūtapati and Paśupati), it is prayed that they should not kill the quadruped, which means that violence is attributed to them.[24] Moreover, the attribution of ṛṣabha (an ox) for Indra through Agni (Jātavedas) is available in the AtharvaVeda.[25]

But to Ṛṣabha only purified butter (ghṛta), havis and ājya are injuncted. Ṛṣabha is quite strong, the killer of enemies, and can put the enemy to the feet of a person who pleases him.[26]

But there is a number of verses where the cow is mentioned as an animal not to be killed (aghnyā).[27] The reason is also given that in a country where the cow is killed and cooked, no mighty ox can take birth.[28] There is another prayer to the king not to eat the cow of a Brāhmaṇa.[29] Preservation of the ox generates good activities (sukṛta).[30]

Eating of the cow is attributed to the non-performers of sacrifices who were defeated as a result of eating the cow of a Brāhmaṇa.[31] (Who are these Vaitahavyas? Can they be identified with the Vrātyas who were non-performers of sacrifice, which is

indicated by the etymology of this word (*vaitahavya-*)? The details are yet to be investigated. But there is no doubt that both violence and non-violence were prevalent amongst the performers and non--performers of sacrifice. But Ṛṣabha or his followers was/were definitely vegetarian(s). Can they be identified with the strictly vegetarian Jains whose first Tīrthaṅkara was Ṛṣabhadeva, to whom the activities of fight, writing and agriculture (asi, masi, kṛṣi) were attributed?)

Vrātyas in the AtharvaVeda

In the 15th chapter of the AtharvaVeda, there is a description of the Vrātyas which can only be understood symbolically. The main features of Vrātyas are their intelligence (haṃsa)[32], oratory (stanayitnu)[33], having a relation with trade (of food-grains: anna)[34], having a blend of faith (śraddhā) and yajña[35], their migration to the southern direction in the form of Indra[36] (perhaps where Indra could not reach) and their stability (svadhā) and their direction being the South (yamaloka)[37]. (Can this type of migration be identified as the migration of the vegetarian, non-sacrificing Jains to the South, from Sindhu (Indus?) which was eclipsed by Indra and his all other alliance forces who forced Vrātyas and Paṇis to go out of Sindhu, and which was ruled mainly by Bṛhaspati and his preceptor Aṅgiras?) Elsewhere modesting of Vṛṣākṣu (a variant of Vṛṣabha?) by Indra through the Sun (one of the alliance) is alluded to.[38]

It appears that the Great Ṛṣabha (mahāvṛṣa) was not only a forceful king but also had a territory in his name, which is mentioned with Mūjavant and Balhika. The sacrifice and vrata of anaḍvant (Whitney: (1.)166: 'draft-ox') appears to be a vrata for twelve nights performed by the followers of Ṛṣabha, which was given the nomenclature accordingly.[39] Mahādeva is enumerated as a forceful deity together with Soma, Varuṇa, Mṛtyu and Indra.[40] (Is it a proper name (later Mahāvīra) which made its place amongst the warriors of Indra?) Agni has been given the epithet "Vṛṣabha of the earth" due to its forceful character.[41] At another place, Vṛṣabha has been recognized as a sovereign king (svarājaṃ vṛṣabham).[42]

This appears to show that Vṛṣabha and his followers had a

forceful sovereignty and territory and although once upon defeated, they compelled the deities, followers of Indra, to enumerate him as one of them. Slowly the identity of Indra and Vṛṣabha was established, which extended to all other deities.

Reconciliation of Indra and Vṛṣabha

Slowly Ṛṣabha got an importance in Aryan mythology and attained an identity with Indra or Agni through his powerful activities.[43] Ṛṣabha became a necessary hand for victory, and he participated with Indra in the battlefield.[44] With Indra, who became thousandfold in later mythology, Ṛṣabha also became thousandfold with universal form.[45] In later mythology, there is a desire that Indra in order to kill Vṛtra should become Vṛṣabha.[46] In fact, for agriculture also, which was later associated with Indra as well, he became an irresistible taskmaster.[47]

Establishment: Slowly there was a peaceful reconciliation of Ṛṣabha and Indra to the extent that for protection, with Indra and Vāyu, Ṛṣabha was also invoked.[48] Indra invoked Ṛṣabha to kill Vṛtra.[49] He was eulogized along with Indra for his powerful activities and victory.[50]

Indra's deterioration: Slowly Indra's position was deteriorating. The confidence in the victory of Indra was lessening, and there was sorrow in the prayers of his appreciators.[51]

Indra mixed up with the farmers and emerged from hero to a farmer[52] which might be due to the impact of Ṛṣabha cult. The lost business of the Paṇis had an impact on his person and he is depicted as a "vaṇij" (= Paṇi's identity). There is a prayer for bestowing wealth.[53] The fierce vigour of Indra and acquisition of the cows at one place[54] may be due to the impact of Ṛṣabhaism over Indraism. The strong body of a Tīrthaṅkara in Jain tradition might have been inherited through this unity. The instructions to paśus by the Bull--Indra[55] are the output of their complete identity.

Sovereign Ṛṣabha: Ṛṣabha, allegorically spoken of as the father of calves and husband of cows, became the father or protector of the great Gargara[56] (ocean banks) which may be identified with the strongest seat of Jainism, i.e. the mount Ābu which is frequently

alluded to in the AtharvaVeda. This seat of Ṛṣabha had become so dominant that the oldest mountain Ābu (Arbudi/Arbuda) was given the name Ṛṣabha mountain.[57] In fact, it might have been the mountain Arbudi or a nearby place (nyarbudi) where the Indra--Ṛṣabha conflict might have happened, which is recorded by the AtharvaVeda.[58] The killing of a number of friends and foe heroes by hounds are recorded here.[59] It is this place which is mentioned by name where the confederacy among the three forces (triṣandhi) took place.[60] There is an invocation to Arbudi to get up for the battlefield with his force against the triṣandhi.[61] But in the vicinity of Arbudi (nyarbudi), there are foolish foes[62] who are not coming to help. (Is it ṛṣi Aṅgiras who helped the opponents?) The geographical situations have been identified by the French scholar, Halévy[63], who identified Dāha with tribus dehiennes, Śūdra with Sudraka, Syndrakoi, Balhika with Bactria, Mahāvṛṣa with Orasaci and Mūjavant with Mozontes. Though the paper is not available to the present writer, it seems that Halévy has not tried to identify Arbudi. But in the ṚgVeda, it is Ahirbudhn(y)a, the seat of the Paṇis, which changed phonetically to Arbuda and NIA. Ābu.

Cow: The mystic character of the cow is propounded in AtharvaVeda 10.10.(2-6). Her protective faculty and identification with various deities show her allegorical and mystic character also.

Allegory of Ṛṣabha: Like the cow, Ṛṣabha has also been allegorically identified with various deities and has also developed its Universal Character (viśvarūpa), due to which he entered all the existent entities. The following identifications of Ṛṣabha are clear in the AtharvaVeda.

Ṛṣabha = rain-god: Maharṣabha thunders, pours rains and satisfies the earth with waters.[64] Elsewhere, the waters are said to be the wives of the Vṛṣa.[65]

Ṛṣabha = Viśvarūpa: Rising from the waters (payasvān), Ṛṣabha got the status of Viśvarūpa, having the force of Indra, Varuṇa, Aśvin, Marut and Bṛhaspati.[66] It is very important that in later classical mythology, out of the trinity, only Viṣnu could get the status of Viśvarūpa.

Ṛṣabha = the Sun: Repeating the mantra of the ṚgVeda,

AtharvaVeda also propounds the characteristics of seven-rayed, forceful Sun who killed Rauhiṇa.[67]

Ṛṣabha = Agni: Thousand-horned Vṛṣabha or Vṛṣa, which was originally aquatic[68], has been equated with Agni or its other forms[69]. In the form of Vaiśvānara, its burning faculty is also propounded.[70]

Vṛṣabha = Rohita: As stated earlier, Vṛṣabha was identified with the Sun; here Vṛṣabha has been identified with Rohita[71], i.e. the Reddish Sun. But the adjective tigmaśṛṅga used applies to Rohita having vertical rays as well as to Vṛṣabha having curly horns.

Vṛṣabha = Rudra: Continuing the relation with Rohita, Vṛṣabha has also been identified with Rudra in the context of Bṛhaspati and Aṅgiras, where a few adjectives like adribhid[72], dvibarhijanman and rodasī[73] applies to Rudra as well. At another place, in the context of Vrātya, he is mentioned as Nīlalohita and identified with Īśāna[74] which appears as an epithet of Lord Śiva (Nīlalohita) in later mythology. An explanation pointing to the killing of the enemy, in the opinion of the Brahmavādins, has been attributed to the epithet Nīlalohita.[75] Due to his increasing power he became mahāvīra.[76]

Vṛṣan = bestower of speech: A few clues in the AtharvaVeda indicate that Vṛṣa has been identified with Vāc[77] and in later grammatical literature was definitely enjoined with Vāc[78]. This relation was the subsistence of all the paśus.[79]

Vrātyas = Mahat = Mahādeva: Slowly in allegory, Vrātya is identified with Mahat element due to its greatness. The explanation of Mahat is given in the AtharvaVeda itself as 'senior' (Jyeṣṭha).[80] It was the stage when he was philosophically attaining Universal Identity with all the beings.

Vrātya = Indradhanus: Due to its multifarious colours and a number of forms, Vrātya has been described as the bow of Indra.[81] Philosophically, it is also the form when he incorporates in himself a number of universal forms.

Another allegory may be interpreted in the context of the expansion of Vrātyas or a class of Jains to various parts of India together with a number of features which are preserved even today amongst the Jains (they are faith (śraddhā), intelligence (vijñāna),

beautiful dress and ornaments). The migration of one of its branches to the South appears in the form of Pāśupata.[82] Non-violence[83] and the protection of animals[84] are two more characteristics available in the AtharvaVeda.

Conclusion

The AtharvaVeda (Śaunaka) not only preserves, together with the meaning of 'Ox/Bull', various stories or their versions about Ṛṣabha along with details which are found in nucleus forms in the ṚgVeda, but also enhances the theme. It gives a full history of the development of Ṛṣabhaism in association with other deities like those included in confederacy. There was definitely a conflict of Indra and his followers and alliances with Ṛṣabha who did not belong to that culture and had a different identity in a different region which might be extending from Mount Ābu to Sindh. The conflict with Indra definitely had a to and fro impact on agriculture, trade and method of war and resulted in a composite culture of the region whose history is otherwise lost, except for being preserved to some extent in the AtharvaVeda. The features of the culture and the emergence of Ṛṣabhadeva as the first Tīrthaṅkara exhibit beyond doubt that it had a relation with the oldest form of Jainism, whose earlier features were mixed up with the features of the later Tīrthaṅkaras, and which has been less investigated in the individual analysis.

Taking the Paippalāda into consideration, it must be said that the conflict of Indra vs. Dānavas is available in both the recensions.

Vṛṣa, Vrātya and Vṛṣabha identified with Rudra are not traced in the Paippalāda, but the concept of Nīlalohita is found both in Paippalāda and Śaunaka. Vrātyas are available in both the recensions.

Ṛṣabha as a lord is missing in the Paippalāda. Vṛṣabha as a sovereign is also not found in it. Migration of the Vrātyas is not traced in the Paippalāda, but their rituals are alluded to in both the recensions.

The adjective *vṛṣṇa-* to the deities is missing in the Paippalāda.

In the Śaunaka, the sacrificial cow is alluded to, whereas in

the Paippalāda, such mantras are missing. The prayer to Paśupati and Bhūtapati to spare the biped and quadruped is found in both the recensions.

Not eating the cow of the Brāhmaṇa and such other topics as protecting the cow, defeat of those who eat the cow and propounding her importance are found in both the recensions.

Entry of Vṛṣabha in invocation along with Agni and Indra is not attested in the Paippalāda whereas it is a development in the Śaunaka. But invoking him to kill Vṛtra is found in both the recensions.

The deterioration in the position of Indra is noticed in both the recensions.

Notes

[0] See Ghosh 2000, Non-Aryan Linguistic Elements in the AtharvaVeda, Calcutta, p. 127 s.v. *arbudá-*.

[1] AtharvaVeda, Śaunaka 2.27.5ab: tayāhaṃ śatrūntsākṣa indraḥ sālāvṛkā̃ iva; Paippalāda 2.16.3cd: tayāhaṃ śatrūn sākṣya indras sālāvṛkau iva.

[2] AtharvaVeda, Śaunaka 3.3.3cd: indrastvā hvayatu viḍbhya ābhyaḥ śyeno bhūtvā viśa ā patemāḥ (Paippalāda not found in Bloomfield).

[3] dūre cit santam etc.; Paippalāda 2.74.2 same as in Śaunaka.

[4] ya ugrīṇāmugrabāhur etc., AVŚ. 4.24.2 : ya ugrāṇām ugrabāhur [yayur] yo dānavānāṃ balam āsasāda/ yena jitās sindhavo yena gāvas sa no muñcatv aṃhasaḥ//, AVP. 4.39.3. sahamānaṃ sahojitaṃ svarjitaṃ gojitaṃ saṃdhanājitam, AVŚ. 17.1. 1cd, 2cd, 3cd, 4cd, 5cd: cf. AVP. 18.30.1c-f, 2c-f, 3c-f.

[5] AVŚ. 4.24.5 (: AVP. 4.39.5), AVŚ. 4.23.5cd = AVP. 4.33.5cd (yenāgninā paṇīnindro jigāya sa no muñcatvaṃhasaḥ).

[6] AtharvaVeda, Śaunaka 4.25.5: yena ṛṣayo balamadyotayan. Not traced in Paippalāda.

[7] AVŚ. 20.37.9c ye te havirbhirvi paṇī́radāśan (ṚV. 7.19.9) and 20.91.10a: yadā vājamasanadviśvarūpam (Paippalāda not found in Bloomfield).

[8] AVŚ. 20.128.4: yaśca paṇi raghujiṣṭhyo yaśca devā̃ adāśuriḥ/ dhīrāṇāṃ śaśvatāmahaṃ tadapāgiti śuśruma//. Not traced in Paippalāda.

[9-10] AVŚ. 7.58 (60).2; Generator of calves and cow-products 9.4.4; Vṛṣan 20.127.5; Vṛṣaṇa 20.91.10; Vṛṣa 20.89.8; Vṛṣabha 18.1.11, 20.71.10; Anaḍvant 4.11.1,2; Ṛṣabha 3.23.4, 4.4.8, 14.2.14; Father of calves 9.4.2; Husband of cows 9.4.2; Ṛṣabha 19.36.5; Vṛṣan 8.5.12, 18.4.58, 19.13.3, 20.17.6,8, 37.6, 94.4, 127.5; Vṛṣabha (tigmaśṛṅga) 20.37.1, 126.15 etc.; Aquatic 18.3.18.

For Paippalāda see appendix to this paper (also for note 11).

[11] Vṛṣabha=mighty AVŚ. 20.17.3, 22.1, 36.1, 47.1, 94.3; Vṛṣaṇa 20.12.6, 37.6, 91.9 (with Bṛhaspati), 102.3; Vṛṣatvan 20.61.5; Vṛṣan 14.1.43, 20.37.6, 81.2, 102.1; Vṛṣamanyu 20.72.1; Vṛṣṇi 20.92.21; Vṛṣṇya 20.94.1; Vṛṣṇyāvant 20.36.1.

[12] saṃ vaḥ sṛjatvaryamā saṃ pūṣā etc., Śaunaka 3.14.2 : saṃ vas sṛjātvaryamā saṃ pūṣā saṃ bṛhaspatiḥ/ samindro yo dhanaṃjaya iha puṣyati yad vasu//, Paippalāda 2.13.1:

yena dhanena prapaṇaṃ carāmi etc., Śaunaka 3.15.6 : yat paṇena pratipaṇaṃ carāmi svena devā dhanam icchamānaḥ/ indro me tasmin rucimā dadhātu bṛhaspatis savitā somo agniḥ//, Paippalāda 19.49.3.

[13] kaḥ pṛśniṃ dhenuṃ varuṇena etc., Śaunaka 7.104 (109).1 : kaḥ pṛśniṃ dhenuṃ varuṇena dattāmatharvaṇe sudughāṃ dhenumetām/ tāṃ bṛhaspatinā sakhyaṃ juṣāṇo yathāvaśaṃ tanvaṃ kalpayāti//, Paippalāda 20.3.6.

[14] sarve devā atyāyantu tṛṣaṃdher etc., Śaunaka 11.10.15. Not traced in Paippalāda.

[15] tayendro hantu vṛtrahā vajreṇa triṣaṃdhinā, AVŚ. 11.10.27 (not found in Paippalāda).

[16] yāmindreṇa saṃdhāṃ samadhatthā brahmaṇā ca bṛhaspate/ tayāhamindrasaṃdhayā ...//, Śaunaka 11.10.9. Not traced in Paippalāda.

[17] bṛhaspatirāṅgirasa ṛṣayo brahmasaṃśitāḥ/ asurakṣayaṇaṃ vadhaṃ triṣaṃdhiṃ divyāśrayan//, Śaunaka 11.10.10 (cf. also vss. 11-13). Not found in Paippalāda.

[18] Śaunaka 11.10.12 (not traced in Paippalāda): sarvā̃llokāntsamajayan etc.; Śaunaka 11.10.13 (not traced in Paippalāda): bṛhaspatirāṅgiraso vajraṃ etc.

[19] Śaunaka 11.10.4: antardhehi jātaveda āditya kuṇapaṃ bahu/ triṣaṃdheriyaṃ senā suhitāstu me vaśe//.

[20] vāyuramitrāṇāmiṣvagrāṇyāñcatu, Śaunaka 11.10.16 : not traced in Paippalāda.

[21] AVŚ. 4.29.3,4. A number or ṛṣis, viz. Aṅgiras, Jamadagni, Kaśyapa, Vasiṣṭha, Bharadvāja, Viśvāmitra, Medhātithi, Gotama and Mudgala, along with a number of deities, are enumerated in the list. Their detailed regions and characteristics, of which a few are alluded to here, are to be investigated with their history and their relation to ṛṣabha. Cf.: Śaunaka 4.29.3 : : Paippalāda 4.38.3 – yāvaṅgirasam a[va]tho yāvagastiṃ mitrāvaruṇā ja[madagni]matrim/ yau kaśyapama[va]tho yau vasiṣṭhaṃ tau no muñcatamaṃhasaḥ//; cf. Paippalāda 4.38.5: yau śyāvāśvam avatho yau gaviṣṭhiraṃ mitrāvaruṇā pu[ru]mīḍhamatrim/ yau vimadamavathas saptavadhriṃ tau no muñcatamaṃhasaḥ//. There is a transplantation of the words in the mantras in the same set, cf. Śaunaka 4.29.4. With yau medhātithimavatho yau triśokaṃ mitrāvaruṇāvuśanāṃ kāvyaṃ yau/ yau gotamamavathaḥ prota mudgalaṃ tau no muñcatamaṃhasaḥ// (Śaunaka 4.29.6), cf. Paippalāda 4.38.6: yau medhātithimavatho yau triśokaṃ mitrāvaruṇā uśanāṃ kāvyaṃ yau/ yau mudgalamavatho

gautamaṃ ca tau no muñcatamaṃhasaḥ//; there is a transplantation of the words in the mantras in the same set.

See Paippalāda 4.38.4: yau bharadvājamavatho [yau] vadhryaśvaṃ viśvāmitraṃ varuṇa mitra kutsam/ yau kakṣīvantamavathaḥ prota kaṇvaṃ tau no muñcatamaṃhasaḥ//, and cf. Śaunaka 4.29.5: there is a transplantation of the words in the mantras in the same set.

[22] Śaunaka 3.19.4cd: indrasya vajrāttīkṣṇīyāṃso yeṣāmasmi purohitaḥ (= Paippalāda 3.19.3cd).

[23] Śaunaka 9.4.9: daivīrviśaḥ payasvānā tanoṣi tvāmindraṃ tvāṃ sarasvantam āhuḥ/ sahasraṃ sa ekamukhā dadāti yo brāhmaṇa ṛṣabhamā juhoti// (: Paippalāda 16.24.9).

[24] bhavāśarvau mṛḍataṃ mābhi yātaṃ bhūtapatī paśupatī namo vām/ pratihitāmāyatāṃ mā vi srāṣṭaṃ mā no himsiṣṭaṃ dvipado mā catuṣpadaḥ//, Śaunaka 11.2.1. In Paippalāda 16.104.1 there is a change of position of the words, viz., paśupatī bhūtapatī in place of bhūtapatī paśupatī in Śaunaka.

[25] Śaunaka 9.4.3 : : Paippalāda 16.24.3; pumānantarvān sthaviraḥ payasvā[n] in the Paippalāda in place of pumānantarvāntsthaviraḥ payasvān in Śaunaka. Rest in the Paippalāda is the same as in Śaunaka.

[26] Śaunaka 9.2.1 : : Paippalāda 16.76.1. Same text.

[27] AVŚ. 10.10.1.

[28] AVŚ. 5.19.4: brahmagavī pacyamānā yāvatsābhi vijaṅgahe/ tejo rāṣṭrasya nirhanti na vīro jāyate vṛṣā// = Paippalāda 9.19.1 (pumān for vṛṣā; rest is the same as in Śaunaka).

[29] Śaunaka 5.18.1: naitāṃ te devā adadustubhyaṃ nṛpate attave/ mā brāhmaṇasya rājanya gāṃ jighatso anādyām// (= Paippalāda 9.17.1, same as in Śaunaka).

[30] Śaunaka 4.11.4: anaḍvān duhe sukṛtasya etc. = Paippalāda 3.25.2: anaḍvān duhe sukṛtasya loka ainaṃ pyāyayet pavamānaḥ purastāt/ parjanyo dhārā maruta ūdho asya yajñaḥ payo dakṣiṇā doho asya//.

[31] Śaunaka 5.18.10cd: te brāhmaṇasya gāṃ jagdhvā vaitahavyāḥ parābhavan (Paippalāda not found in Bloomfield). It exhibits that the Brāhmaṇas were vegetarians and the distinguishing feature of the Vaitahavyas was taking beef which was the reason of their defeat. These Vaitahavyas might have been a lost branch of the earlier non-performers of sacrifice who might be different from the later Jains.

[32] Śaunaka 15.2.19: ha[ṃ]so [– ed.] māgadhaḥ (not traced in Paippalāda).

[33] Śaunaka 15.2.25: stanayitnur māgadho .... Not traced in Paippalāda.

[34] Śaunaka 15.8.3: viśāṃ vai sa sabandhūnāṃ .... Not traced in Paippalāda.

[35] Śaunaka 15.7.4: taṃ śraddhā ca yajñaśca lokaścānnaṃ cānnādyaṃ ca bhūtvābhiparyāvartanta. Not traced in Paippalāda.

[36] Śaunaka 15.14.3: sa yaddakṣiṇāṃ diśamanu. Not traced in Paippalāda.

[37] Śaunaka 15.14.13-14: sa yat pitṝnanuvyacaladyamo rājā bhūtvānuvyacalatsvadhākāramannādaṃ kṛtvā. svadhākāreṇānnādenānnamatti ya evaṃ veda (not traced in the Paippalāda).

[38] Śaunaka 20.128.13: tvaṃ vṛkṣākṣuṃ maghavannamraṃ .... Not traced in the Paippalāda.

[39] See Śaunaka 5.22.4-5.8; cf. adharāñcaṃ pra hiṇomi etc. 5.22.4 (Paippalāda 13.1.5: adharāñcaṃ pra hiṇomi namaḥ kṛtvāya takmane/ śakaṃbharasya muṣṭihā punargaccha mahāvṛṣān//). Cf. Śaunaka 4.11.11: dvādaśa vā etā rātrīrvratyā āhuḥ prajāpateḥ etc.; Paippalāda 3.25.7: dvādaśaitā rā[trī]rvratyā āhuḥ prajāpatervratyā rātrīrdvādaśa/ tad vāpi brahma yo veda tad vā anaḍuho balam//.

[40] somo rājā varuṇo rājā mahādeva uta mṛtyurindraḥ, Śaunaka 5.21.11cd.

[41] AVŚ. 6.34.1.

[42] Śaunaka 20.113.2. Not traced in Paippalāda.

[43] AVŚ. 4.24.3; 5.21.11 (Indra and Agni = Vṛṣaṇau: pracarṣaṇī vṛṣaṇā vajrabāhū agnimindraṃ vṛtrahaṇā huve'ham, Śaunaka 7.110 (115).2cd, cf. 20.14.9cd in Paippalāda; cf. also Śaunaka 20.12.6).

[44] See note 46.

[45] AVŚ. 9.4.1 (AVP. 16.24.1).

[46] Śaunaka 20.137.12: tamindraṃ vājayāmasi mahe vṛtrāya hantave/ sa vṛṣā vṛṣabho bhuvat// (not traced in Paippalāda).

The repetition of the root *vṛṣ-* confirms the fact that one root is for 'powerful' and the other definitely for 'a proper name' and not for 'a bull'.

[47] AVŚ. 7.110 (115).2cd (see note 43), 19.27.1 (see note 48).

[48] Śaunaka 19.27.1, Paippalāda 10.7.1: gobhiṣṭvā pātvṛṣabho vṛṣā tvā.

[49] Cf. note 50.

[50] Śaunaka 19.13.1: indrasya bāhū sthavirau vṛṣāṇau etc. (Paippalāda 7.4.1, with the variant yokṣye for yokṣe).

[51] āśuḥ śiśāno vṛṣabho etc., Śaunaka 19.13.2 : : Paippalāda 7.4.2 āśuś śiśāno vṛṣabho na bhīmo ghanāghanaḥ kṣobhanaścarṣaṇīnām/ saṃkrandano'nimiṣa ekavīraś śataṃ scnā ajayatsākamindraḥ//.

[52] Śaunaka 3.17.4: indraḥ sītāṃ ni gṛhṇātu tāṃ pūṣābhi rakṣatu etc.; Paippalāda 2.22.5: indras sītāṃ ni gṛhṇātu tāṃ pūṣā mahyaṃ rakṣatu/ sā naḥ payasvatī duhām uttarāmuttarāṃ samām//; ṚV. 4.57.7.

[53] Śaunaka 3.15.1: indramahaṃ vaṇijaṃ codayāmi sa na aitu puraetā no astu/ nudannarātiṃ paripanthinaṃ mṛgaṃ sa īśāno dhanadā astu mahyam//; Paippalāda 19.49.1: indraṃ vayaṃ vaṇijaṃ havāmahe sa nastrātā pura etu prajānan/ ghnannarātiṃ paripanthinaṃ mṛgaṃ [sa] īśāno dhanadā [a]stu mahyam//.

[54] balavijñāyaḥ sthaviraḥ pravīraḥ etc., Saunaka 19.13.5 : : Paippalāda 7.4.5 balavijñāyas sthaviraḥ pravīras sahasvān vājī sahamāna ugraḥ/ abhivīro abhisatvā sahojijjaitramindra rathamā tiṣṭha govidam//; indrasya vṛṣṇo varuṇasya rājñaḥ, Śaunaka 19.13.10a (Paippalāda 7.4.10a); Śaunaka 20.1.1: indra tvā vṛṣabhaṃ vayaṃ etc. (not traced in the Paippalāda); girvaṇaḥ pāhi naḥ sutam etc., Śaunaka 20.6.6 (not traced in Paippalāda); viṣūvṛdindro amateruta kṣudhaḥ etc., Śaunaka 20.17.3 (not traced in Paippalāda).

[55] Śaunaka 4.11.2: anaḍvānindraḥ sa etc. (not traced in Paippalāda).

[56] Śaunaka 9.4.4ab, Paippalāda 16.24.5ab: pitā vatsānāṃ patiraghnyānāmatho pitā mahatāṃ gargarāṇām etc.

[57] parvatasya vṛṣabhasyādhi pṛṣṭhe navāścaranti saritaḥ purāṇīḥ, Śaunaka 12.2.41cd (Paippalāda 17.34.2cd).

[58] Śaunaka 11.9.4 (not traced in Paippalāda): arbudirnāma yo deva īśānaśca nyarbudiḥ/ yābhyāmantarikṣamāvṛtamiyaṃ ca pṛthivī mahī// tābhyāmindramedibhyāmahaṃ jitamanvemi senayā///.

[59] Śaunaka 11.10.23 (not found in Paippalāda): ye varmiṇo ye'varmāṇo amitrā ye ca varmiṇaḥ/ sarvāṃstā arbude hataṃchvāno'dantu bhūmyām//.

[60] Śaunaka 11.9.23: arbudiśca triṣaṃdhiścāmitrānno vi vidhyatām/ yathaiṣām indra vṛtrahanhanāma sācīpate'mitrāṇāṃ sahasraśaḥ// (not traced in the Paippalāda).

[61] Śaunaka 11.10.5: uttiṣṭha tvaṃ devajanārbude senayā saha/ ayaṃ balirva āhutastriṣaṃdherāhutiḥ priyā// (not traced in Paippalāda).

[62] Śaunaka 11.10.20 (not found in Paippalāda): śitipadī saṃ patatvamitrāṇāmamūḥ sicaḥ/ muhyantvadyāmūḥ senā amitrāṇāṃ nyarbude//, and Śaunaka 11.10.21 (not traced in Paippalāda): mūḍhā amitrā nyarbude jahyeṣāṃ varaṃvaram/ anayā jahi senayā//.

[63] Halévy, J., "Notes sur la géographie de l'Atharva-Véda", in: Revue Sémitic (Paris) 13, p. 352 (cited at Louis Renou, Bibliographie Védiquc, Paris 1931: 164, item 143.23).

[64] Śaunaka 4.15.1-4. 4.15.1 (Paippalāda 5.7.1): samutpatantu pradiśo nabhasvatīḥ etc.; gaṇāstvopa gāyantu etc., Śaunaka 4.15.4 (Paippalāda 5.7.5: gaṇās tvopa gāyantu mārutāḥ parjanya ghoṣiṇaḥ pṛthak/ sargā varṣasya varṣatas sṛjantu pṛthivīmanu//); yāmāpīnāmupasīdantyāpaḥ etc., Śaunaka 9.1.9 (Paippalāda 16.32.9; variants: yāṃ svarājaḥ for ye svarājaḥ, etc.).

[65] Śaunaka 20.61.3: tad adyā citta ukthino'nu etc. Not traced in Paippalāda.

[66] Śaunaka 9.4.1 = Paippalāda 16.24.1: sāhasrastveṣa ṛṣabhaḥ payasvān etc.; Śaunaka 9.4.8: indrasyaujo varuṇasya bāhū etc. (Paippalāda 16.24.7: indrasya caujo for indrasyaujo).

[67] uddhedabhi śrutāmagham etc., Śaunaka 20.7.1 (not traced in Paippalāda); yaḥ saptaraśmirvṛṣabhastuviṣmān etc., Śaunaka 20.34.13 = Paippalāda 13.7.13.

[68] Śaunaka 13.1.2 = Paippalāda 18.15.2: udvāja ā ganyo apsvantar etc.

[69] yo no durasyāddipsācca (etc.), Śaunaka 4.36.1c (not traced in Paippalāda); vṛṣā me ravo nabhasā na etc., Śaunaka 5.13.3 : : vṛṣā me ravo rabhasā ni tanyatur ugreṇa taṃ vacasā bādhe tu te/ ahaṃ tamasya nṛbhiragrabhaṃ rasaṃ jyotiṣeva tamasa udetu sūryaḥ//, Paippalāda 8.2.1.

[70] Śaunaka 4.36.1ab (not traced in Paippalāda): tāntsatyaujāḥ pra dahatvagnirvaiśvānaro vṛṣā.

[71] Śaunaka 13.1.25: yo rohito vṛṣabhastigmaśṛṅgaḥ/ paryagniṃ pari sūryaṃ babhūva// (= Paippalāda 18.17.5, with minor variants).

[72] Śaunaka 20.90.1: yo adribhitprathamajā etc. Not traced in Paippalāda.

[73] ṚV. 1.114.10; cf. 5.56.8.

[74] Śaunaka 15.1.5 (sa devānāmīśāṃ paryait etc.) : : Paippalāda 18.27.5 sa īśāno'bhavat/ sa devānām [īśāṃ paryait]/; nīlamasyodaraṃ lohitaṃ pṛṣṭham, Śaunaka 15.1.7 (Paippalāda 18.27.7: nīlamasyodaraṃ lohitamasya pṛṣṭham).

[75] nīlenaivāpriyaṃ bhrātṛvyaṃ prorṇoti etc., Śaunaka 15.1.8 (Paippalāda 18. 27.8: nīlenāpriyaṃ lokoti ?/ lohitena dviṣantaṃ vidhyatīti brahmavādino vadanti/).

[76] so'vardhata sa mahānabhavat etc., Śaunaka 15.1.4 (Paippalāda 18.27.4). See note 80.

[77] stanayitnuste vāk etc., Śaunaka 9.1.10 (Paippalāda 16.32.10).

[78] Cf. Patañjali at MahāBhāṣya, Paspaśāhnika: catvāri śṛṅgā trayo asya pādā dve śīrṣe sapta hastāso asya/ tridhā baddho vṛṣabho roravīti maho devo martyā ā viveśa// (ṚV. 4.58.3).

[79] stanayitnuste vāk etc., Śaunaka 9.1.20 : Paippalāda 16.32.10ab (with variant adhi for divi), 16.33.10cd.

[80] tadekamabhavattallalāmamabhavat etc., Śaunaka 15.1.3 (Paippalāda 18.27.3, with variant and transplantation of words: tadekamabhavat/ tallalāmamabhavat/ ... tattapo'bhavat/ tatsatyamabhava[t]/ tadbrahmābhavat/ tena prājāyata/); so'vardhata sa mahānabhavat etc., Śaunaka 15.1.4 (Paippalāda 18.27.4: so'vardhata/ sa mahānabhavat/ sa mahādevo'bhavat/).

[81] sa ekavrātyo'bhavat etc., Śaunaka 15.1.6 (Paippalāda 18.27.6: [sa] ekavrātyo 'bhavat/ sa dhanurā[da]tta/ [ta]dindradhanurabhavat/).

[82] Śaunaka 15.2.10: taṃ yajñāyajñiyaṃ ca etc.

[83] yajñāyajñiyāya ca vai sa etc., Śaunaka 15.2.11. Not traced in the Paippalāda.

[84] yajñāyajñiyasya ca vai sa vāmadevyasya etc., Śaunaka 15.2.12. Not traced in Paippalāda.

Appendix

(Citations from the PaippalādaSaṃhitā with references to notes 9-11)

yadā vājamasanad etc., Śaunaka 20.91.10, ṚV. 10.67.10. Not traced in Paippalāda.

indrāvaruṇā etc., Śaunaka 7.58 (60).2 = Paippalāda 20.6.6 (variant: cd idaṃ vām asme pariṣiktam andha āsadyāsmin barhiṣi mādayethām).

vṛṣṇe te harī vṛṣaṇā etc., Śaunaka 20.37.6. Not traced in Paippalāda.

vatso jarāyu etc., Śaunaka 9.4.4. Not traced in Paippalāda.

pra rebhāso manīṣā etc., Śaunaka 20.127.5. Not traced in Paippalāda.

pra yamantarvṛṣasavāso etc., Śaunaka 20.89.8. Not traced in Paippalāda.

ātmanvatyurvarā nārīyam etc., Śaunaka 14.2.14. Paippalāda 18.8.5 (variant: cd sā vaḥ prajāṃ janayad vakṣaṇābhyo bibhratī ? dudram ṛṣadūvevendraḥ ?).

ā dhātā gacchānu etc., Śaunaka 18.1.11. Not traced in Paippalāda.

asṛgramindra te etc., Śaunaka 20.71.10. Not traced in Paippalāda.

hiraṇyaśṛṅgaḥ etc., Śaunaka 19.36.5. Also cf. 4.5.1 (Paippalāda 4.6.1: hiraṇyaśṛṅgo vṛṣabho yas samudrād udācarat/ tenā sahasyenā vayaṃ ni janān svāpayāmasi//).

dhenā avacākaśadvṛṣā, Śaunaka 20.17.6b. Not traced in Paippalāda.

vṛṣā na kruddhaḥ etc., Śaunaka 20.17.8. Not traced in Paippalāda.

vṛṣā matīnāṃ pavate vicakṣaṇaḥ etc., Śaunaka 18.4.58. Not traced in Paippalāda.

evā patiṃ droṇasacāṃ etc., Śaunaka 20.94.4. Not traced in Paippalāda.

tadindreṇa jayata etc., Śaunaka 19.13.3cd = Paippalāda 7.4.3cd.

yastigmaśṛṅgo etc., Śaunaka 20.37.1. Not traced in Paippalāda.

vṛṣabho na tigmaśṛṅgo etc., Śaunaka 20.126.15. Not traced in Paippalāda.

añjate vyañjate samañjate etc., Śaunaka 18.3.18. Also ṚV. 9.86.43, SV. 1.564, 2.964. Not traced in Paippalāda.

Cf. also yathā sindhur nadīnām, Śaunaka 14.1.43 = Paippalāda 18.4.10, as also the following Śaunaka mantras, which cannot be traced in the Paippalāda:

indras tvā vṛṣabham, 18.3.65, 20.1.1;

tasyedime pravaṇe saptasindhavo etc., 20.17.3;

abhi tvā vṛṣabha sute sutaṃ etc., 20.22.1, also ṚV. 8.45.22, SV. 1.161, 2.81;

yaḥ patyate vṛṣabho etc., Śaunaka 20.36.1cd;

tamindraṃ vājayāmasi, 20.47.1;

pratyakṣasaṃ vṛṣabhaṃ etc., 20.94.3cd;

evedindraṃ vṛṣaṇaṃ vajrabāhuṃ etc., 20.12.6;

bṛhaspatiṃ vṛṣaṇaṃ etc., 20.91.9;

gavyanta indraṃ etc., 20.125.3;

vṛṣaṇaṃ tvā vayaṃ vṛṣan etc., 20.102.3;

yasya dvirbarhaso bṛhatsaho etc., 20.61.5;

ā paprātha mahinā etc., 20.81.2;

īlenyo namasyastirastamāṃsi etc., 20.102.1;

viśveṣu hi tvā etc., 20.72.1.

Bibliographical information

AtharvaVeda = Śaunaka recension of the AtharvaVeda. Ed. William Dwight Whitney. Revised and edited by Nag Sharan Singh, Vols. 1, 2, Delhi 1987

AtharvaVeda Śaunaka: see preceding

Not found in Bloomfield = in A Vedic Concordance, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1906

Not traced in Paippalāda = Not traced in Atharvavedīyā Paippalāda-saṃhitā, Vols. 1-3, ed. Raghu Vira, Lahore 1936, 1940, 1942

Paippalāda = Atharvavedīyā Paippalāda-saṃhitā, ed. Raghu Vira: see preceding

ṚgVeda = as found at Maurice Bloomfield, A Vedic Concordance: see above

Śaunaka: see AtharvaVeda Śaunaka

SāmaVeda = as found at Maurice Bloomfield, A Vedic Concordance: see above

Acknowledgment

Abhijit Ghosh criticised an earlier draft of the paper and suggested improvements.

Vrātya: the Ur-Monk in the Veda

G.U. Thite

Abstract

The author attempts to show that Vrātya was an Ur-monk and Vrātyahood was almost similar to sannyāsa.

0.1 The subject, viz. Vrātya and his position in ancient Indian cultural life, is slightly controversial. Moreover, there exist numerous misgivings regarding the exact nature of the state of being a Vrātya. In this paper my intention is to show that Vrātya was the Ur-monk and Vrātyahood was almost similar to sannyāsa. It is necessary to remeber that the period in which the concept of Vrātyahood existed was very much prior to the period in which the concept of sannyāsa came into existence.

0.2 In the period in which the Vrātyas possibly existed, there were many intellectual leaders with unformulated doctrines of religion and philosophy. They were wandering free-thinkers, idiosyncratic in their behaviour as well as in their views. Some of them had their own bands of followers. Out of these, some leaders could settle themselves and could lead a steady life, while performing sacrifices, whereas others led a semi-nomadic life. Those who could settle themselves and find some kind of patronage either from a king or from the society at large, became ṛṣis (sages), high-priests or royal chaplains. Those who could not find such patronage, became munis (monks), beggars (bhikṣus), Ājīvikas and out-castes like Vrātyas.

1.1. In the Vedic literature the information about Vrātyas seems to be divided in three layers. The earliest layer is found in the AtharvaVeda, in which there is an independent chapter called Vrātya-kāṇḍa in its Śaunaka recension, of which it is the fifteenth chapter (only fragmentally found in the PaippalādaSaṃhitā at 18.27). In this chapter Vrātyas are highly glorified and honoured. They are described on a cosmic level. A Vrātya is said to have become Mahādeva (15.1.4 : : Paippalāda 18.27.4). Mahādeva or Rudra is described as Ekavrātya i.e. the best Vrātya (15.1.6 : : Paippalāda 18.27.6). A king should consider himself to be lucky when a learned Vrātya comes to his house as guest (15.10.1-2), and should offer hospitality to him

(15.11-12). Details of the merit which one gets if the Vrātya stays for one, two, three or four days in one's house are given (15.13.1-8). If a Vrātya stays in the house of the host for innumerable number of days, the host will get innumerable number of other worlds (15.13.9-10).

1.2 The Vrātyas were thus expected to get numerous facilities by way of hospitality. It is possible that there were some pseudo--Vrātyas who might be trying to call themselves Vrātyas (Vrātya-bruvas, 15.13.11). There is an option in connection with such pseudo-Vrātyas that one may refuse to honour them or one may accept them as guests (15.13.12).

2.1 The second layer is that of the Brāhmaṇa texts and is represented by the Brāhmaṇas which give a detailed description of the sacrifices called Vrātyastomas. Different types of Vrātyas, their way of life, their garments, their language etc. are described in these texts. One of the kinds of Vrātyas is called Garagirs. The word literally means 'those who swallow poison' (TāṇḍyaBrāhmaṇa 17.1.9). This reminds us of the Purāṇic story of the god Śiva drinking poison. It has been already pointed out that the god Rudra (Śiva, Mahādeva) is described as the best Vrātya. So this god represents one of the types of the Vrātyas. It may be pointed out that use of some poisons or narcotics is a common phenomenon in the world of monks. Some Vrātyas who were the prototypes of the modern hippies must be using narcotics and thus be called Gargirs. There are some other Vrātyas who are described as Śamanīcameḍhras (TāṇḍyaBrāhmaṇa 17.4.1). Literally the word means 'those whose penis is hanging down on account of peace (or restraint)'. This indicates that sexual restraint was a part of Vrātyahood.

2.2 The Vrātyadhanas i.e. the things possessed by Vrātyas are mentioned in TāṇḍyaBrāhmaṇa 17.1.14. They consist of a turban, a goad, bow without arrow, a board-covered rough vehicle, a garment with black fringes, two goat-skins (one white and the other black), and a silver ornament worn around the neck. These things belong to the Gṛhapati (lord of house, i.e. the chief among the Vrātyas). The other Vrātyas have "upper garments with red borders and corded fringes with strings at each side". Each one of them has a pair of shoes and doubly joined goat's hides (TāṇḍyaBrāhmaṇa 17.1.15).

2.3 It is also said that the Vrātyas spoke the language of the consecrated persons even if they were not consecrated (Tāṇḍya-Brāhmaṇa 17.1.19). This means that the Vrātyas had their own language which was not understandable by common people.

2.4 All the above-given details indicate that the Vrātya way of life was similar to that of the life of monks. The Vrātyas were the monks of the period in which the concept of monkhood was rather in its preliminary stage. The details of monkhood, sannyāsa etc. were developed in later periods when Buddhism, Jainism and other schools of monkhood developed. The life of the Vrātyas, however, was comparatively a simple form of sannyāsa.

3.1 The third layer of the Vedic texts dealing with the Vrātyas is represented by the Sūtra literature, in which we get information about the Vrātyas which is rather mutually contradictory. In the Brāhmaṇa-texts and in the ŚrautaSūtras we get some information about the Vrātyastoma sacrifices. The nature and purpose of these sacrifices are also not free from contradictory information. The Brāhmaṇa-texts of the SāmaVeda are particularly informative about these sacrifices. But they do not clearly state anything about the performer of these sacrifices. There are two questions in connection with these sacrifices:

(i) who can perform these sacrifices?
(ii) what is the purpose of these sacrifices?

One should remember that the Vrātyastoma-sacrifices are, technically speaking, Śrauta-yajñas; they are Soma-sacrifices of one-day duration. Now a Śrauta-sacrifice can be performed only by a Brāhmaṇa, a Kṣatriya or a Vaiśya. The performer is expected to have undergone the Upanayana-ceremony, done Vedic studies, got ritualisticlly married, and be with his wife living and present with him. Moreover, this performer should have formally established the Śrauta-fires and thus be an Āhitāgni. Therefore, the Vrātyastoma-sacrifices can be performed only by a normal performer (yajamāna) and not by an out-caste.

3.2 Now the real problem is here. The GṛhyaSūtras and the Smṛti-texts consider a Vrātya to be a person who is not initiated at the proper age and is thus deprived of the Sāvitrī formula (Sāvitrī-patita) and consequently of Vedic studies. Thus a Vrātya is, according to these texts, an out-caste. PāraskaraGṛhyaSūtra (2.5.43) says that a Vrātya should perform a Vrātyastoma-sacrifice and then study Veda. According to KātyāyanaŚrautaSūtra (22.4.27-28) also, after the performance of a Vrātyastoma-sacrifice, a Vrātya becomes worthy of being accepted by the society (in connection with food and marriage). ĀśvalāyanaGṛhyaSūtra prohibits any social contact with the Vrātyas (1.17.5-7: in the edition of T. Ganapati Shastri, reprint Delhi 1985), while VasiṣṭhaSmṛti allows a Vrātya to perform a Vrātyastoma and be purified (11.54-59: in the Ānandāśrama edition of H.M. Apte in Smṛtīnāṃ Samuccayaḥ, Poona 1905) : though neither of the references contains the word *vrātya-*, they do refer to "those who are fallen from the Sāvitrī formula (Patita-Sāvitrīka)", and this state is considered to be a characteristic mark of a Vrātya by many medieval thinkers.

3.3 In this context it may be remarked that the GṛhyaSūtras, the Smṛti-texts and even the Śrauta-text of Kātyāyana have neglected the very basic structure of the Śrauta-ritual. Thus, if a Vrātya is one who is not properly initiated and is an out-caste, how can he be able to perform a Śrauta-sacrifice of Soma-nature? For, as is mentioned above, a Śrauta-sacrifice can only be performed by an Āhitāgni (normal sacrificer who is initiated, married, with established fires, etc.). It is obvious then that Vrātyas are not qualified to perform any Śrauta-rite. So, we have to conclude that there are some serious drawbacks in the understanding of the problem of the Vrātyas on the part of the Gṛhya-texts, Smṛti-texts and those who rely only on these texts.

3.4 It should, however, be noted that the ĀpastambaŚrautaSūtra (22.5.4) prescribes the performance of the Vrātyastoma-sacrifices for those who intend to live as Vrātyas (vrātyānāṃ pravāse vrātyastomāḥ). Thus it is clearly stated here that the Vrātyastoma-sacrifices are to be performed for entering into the Vrātya way of life and not for being free from the Vrātyahood. According to ŚāṅkhāyanaŚrautaSūtra 14.69.1-2, gods Vasus went to heaven by performing the Vrātyastoma-sacrifices. Similarly a person desiring to reach heaven can perform the Vrātyastomas. The commentator on

these sūtras clearly states that yaḥ kaś cit traivarṇiko 'dhikārī. So, a Brāhmaṇa, a Kṣatriya or a Vaiśya can perform the Vrātyastomas. Thus it will be again clear that it is not a Vrātya who has to perform the Vrātyastoma-sacrifice.

Summary and Conclusion

4.1 The implications of the Vedic texts on Vrātya and Vrātyastoma-sacrifices are thus as follows:

1) Vrātya was an Ur-monk. The Vrātyas had their own way of life as the monks have.

2) The Vrātyas were highly honoured in the early period. Those Āhitāgnis (fire worshipping, house-holding sacrificers) who desired to become monks of the Vrātya-type were advised to perform the Vrātyastoma-sacrifices and be monks.

3) In a later period, the Vrātya was wrongly understood as an out-caste.

4) The supposition that the Vrātyastoma-sacrifices are to be performed by the Vrātyas for the sake of purification is baseless and forgets the very structure of the Śrauta-ritual. It is quite possible that these sacrifices are totally fictitious and were never actually performed in their original form.

5) These sacrifices are also not meant for converting a non--Hindu into Hinduism. Strictly speaking Hinduism does not know any conversion. There is no ritual procedure for becoming a Hindu. Only a man born of a Hindu father is a Hindu as long as he is not converted to any other religion. There is no return to Hinduism.

6) The Vrātya chapter is one of the rather misunderstood chapters in the history of monkhood and renunciation in ancient India.

Linguistic Studies

Variants of Nominal and Pronominal Forms in the First Kāṇḍa of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā

Hukam Chand Patyal

Abstract

A study of some cases of nominal and pronominal forms of the first kāṇḍa of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā of the AtharvaVeda, along with their variants found in the Śaunaka recension and other Vedic texts.

Abbreviations

ĀpŚrS. = ĀpastambaŚrautaSūtra; ĀśvŚrS. = ĀśvalāyanaŚrautaSūtra; AVP. = AtharvaVeda (Paippalāda); AVŚ. = AtharvaVeda (Śaunaka); HGS. = Hiraṇyakeśi-Gṛhya Sūtra; KS. = KāṭhakaSaṃhitā; Pāṇ. = Pāṇini; PGS. = PāraskaraGṛhyaSūtra; ṚV. = ṚgVeda; ŚPBr. = ŚataPathaBrāhmaṇa; TĀr. = TaittirīyĀraṇyaka; TBr. = Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa; TS. = TaittirīyaSaṃhitā; VS. = VājasaneyiSaṃhitā; VSK. = Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā (Kāṇva recension)

1.0 An attempt is made in this paper to study some cases of nominal and pronominal forms of the first kāṇḍa of the Paippalāda-Saṃhitā of the AtharvaVeda, and find out their variant form(s) in the Śaunaka recension, and also in other Vedic texts.

1.1 The variants are found in the inflection of nouns, pronouns and adjectives. We also come across "phonetic variations" of these nominal and pronominal forms. These variants are of two types, viz. formal variants, and syntactic-cum-stylistic variants. These variants can be seen in case, number and gender. The present writer has already written on the verbal variants of the first kāṇḍa of the Paippalāda (Patyal 2002).

1.2 The Paippalāda was discovered in 1870, and it was based on a single birchbark manuscript partly destroyed and corrupt beyond recognition. This birchbark manuscript was reproduced in 1901 under the supervision of M. Bloomfield and R. Garbe. Leroy Carr Barret made available the so-called "Kashmirian Atharvaveda" (1905--40). The text appeared in the Journal of the American Oriental Society and also as an independent publication of the Oriental Society of America. Raghu Vira produced mutatis mutandis in Devanāgarī the same text (Lahore 1936-42) in three volumes. It was due to the efforts of the late Professor Durgamohan Bhattacharyya

that the PaippalādaSaṃhitā, based on the Orissa manuscripts, is made accessible to us. Volume 1, consisting of kāṇḍa 1, was brought out from Sanskrit College, Calcutta in 1964; Volume 2, consisting of kāṇḍas 2-4, appeared in 1970 from the same College. Now his able son Professor Dipak Bhattacharya has brought out the portion up to 15th kāṇḍa from Asiatic Society, Calcutta. K. Hoffmann (1968: 1) rightly remarks: "... everyone who dealt with the Paippalāda version from a philological or linguistic point of view has, again and again, been driven to despair. There were only rare cases in which the details inferred from the text could be relied upon".

1.3 In this paper citations from the PaippalādaSaṃhitā will be given and then the variants of the same mantras will be provided from other texts. The order of the Paippalāda will be followed in its proper sequence.

2.0 Now follow the citations along with their variants.

2.1 AVP. 1.2.4bc has apām uta praśastiṣv aśvā bhavatha vājinaḥ, while AVŚ. 1.4.4b reads praśastibhiḥ (also VSK. 10.2.3b) for praśastiṣu: 'In (by) praising of the waters, O horses, you become vigorous'. ṚV. 1.23.19bc reads: ... praśastaye/ devā bhavata vājinaḥ: 'Unto praising of the waters, O gods, you be vigorous'. The reading of the Paippalāda with locative is also found at VS. 9.6b, TS. 1.7.7.2b, MS. 1.11.1b (161.11), KS. 13.14b, ŚPBr. 5.1.4.6b (see Bloomfield 1906: 83b). The ṚgVeda original has a dative of purpose, and in later texts it is substituted by instrumental or locative, which are virtually equivalent; with the locative, the praising is the occasion and so the means of becoming vigorous. See Bloomfield et al: 3. secs. 67, 100, 558, 601, 690.

2.2 AVP. 1.11.2ab reads: abhivṛttaḥ sapatnān abhi yā no arātayaḥ. Kashmirian version has the unintelligible reading abhi vari sapatnahā abhi(?). AVŚ. 1.29.2a has abhivṛtya (< *abhi-√vṛt-*, gerund). Whitney: 29 renders: 'Rolling over our rivals, over them that are niggards to us, ...'. We have variation between a past passive participial and a gerundial form. Here the gerund seems to be more suitable.

2.3 AVP. 1.16.2cd has: ā tvā svo aśnutāṃ varṇaḥ parā śvetāni

pātaya. AVŚ. 1.23.2cd reads viśatām for aśnutām, and śuklāni for śvetāni (see Patyal 2002: 294). TBr. 2.4.4.1c reads naḥ for tvā, and this text has the same reading as found in the Paippalāda. Here there is a variation between first and second persons (cf. Bloomfield et al: 3. sec. 720). 'May your own colour enter you, make white things (or spots) fly away.'

2.4 AVP. 1.18.3c reads: ayam agnir dīdāyad āhnam eva. The Kashmirian version has ᵓdaṃhanam eva, and the Mahantipura set of manuscripts (recorded by Bhattacharyya: 19) has ᵓdāhnum eva. AVŚ. 3.8.3c reads ayam agnir dīdāyad dīrgham eva. Padapāṭha reads dīdayat (< *dī-* or *dīdī-* 'to shine'), subjunctive 3/1, also see ṚV. 10.30.4, 10.95.12. The AVP. form *āhna-* is from *ahan-*, with *-añ* (Pāṇ. 4.2.45); this word is also attested in ŚPBr. 6.6.4.3. Whitney: 96 renders: 'may this fire shine for very long'; the AVP. line may be translated as: 'May this fire shine for a succession of days'.

2.5 AVP. 1.19.2a has: asmai devāḥ pradiśi jyotir astu. AVŚ. 1.9.2a reads asya (also Kashmirian version); we also have asmin in a photostat copy of a manuscript of the Paippalāda deposited in the Royal Asiatic Society, Mumbai. For cases of variations between dative, genitive and locative, see Bloomfield et al: 3. secs. 614ff. Whitney: 9 translates: 'At his direction, O gods, be there light, ...'.

2.6 AVP. 1.19.4ab reads: aiṣāṃ yajñam uta bhare 'haṃ rāyaṣpoṣam uta vittāny agne. This part in the Kashmirian version is defaced. AVŚ. 1.9.4ab has: ... dade 'ham ... cittāny agne. Whitney: 10 remarks that doubtless vittāni should be read for cittāni, but Sāyaṇa has buddhim. Whitney, 1.c. renders: 'I take to myself their sacrifice and splendour, their abundance of wealth and their intents, O Agni'. The AVP. line may be translated as: 'I bear to myself their sacrifice and splendour, their abundance of wealth and their acquisitions, O Agni'.

2.7 AVP. 1.22.3a has aśloṇas te haviṣā vidheyam, while AVŚ. 1.31.3b reads aśloṇas tvā ghṛtena juhomi. Kashmirian version has aśroṇas te. Sāyaṇa reads here aśroṇaḥ. The variation between *l* and *r* is quite interesting. Also see AVŚ. 6.120.3c: aśloṇā (Sāyaṇa aśroṇā) aṅgair ahrutāḥ; TĀr. 2.6.2c has aśloṇāṅgair ahṛtāḥ (for these variants see Bloomfield+Edgerton: 2. secs. 261, 683, 819, 980, 990).

Whitney: 31 renders: 'unmaimed I make oblation to thee with ghee'. The AVP. line may be translated as: 'Unmaimed I worship you with oblation'. Here variation between dative te and accusative tvā is also interesting.

2.8 AVP. 1.27.1d has saptarṣīṇāṃ haviṣābhayaṃ no 'stu; AVŚ. 6.40.1d reads saptaṛṣīṇāṃ ca haviṣābhayaṃ no astu. Whitney: 310 translates: 'and by the oblation of the seven seers be there fearlessness for us'. For hiatus, see Pāṇ. 6.1.128: ṛty akaḥ. For cases of hiatus and absence of hiatus, see Bloomfield+Edgerton: 2. sec. 919, and also secs. 990ff.

2.9 AVP. 1.28.2cd has yathā tvam arapā aso atho aharito bhava. Kashmirian version does not have atho. AVŚ. 1.22.2cd has yathāyam arapā asad atho aharito bhuvat. Here we see variation between second person singular and third person singular. Paippalāda has tvam whereas Śaunaka has ayam (for variants of pronominal forms, see Bloomfield et al: 3. secs. 301-20). asaḥ of Paippalāda is 2/1 subjunctive, whereas asat of Śaunaka is 3/1 subjunctive; Paippalāda bhava is 2/1 imperative, whereas Śaunakīya bhuvat is root aorist 3/1 subjunctive. Whitney: 23 renders: 'that this man may be free from complaints (*-rapas*), also may become not yellow'. Bloomfield 1897: 7 translates: 'May this person go unscathed, and be free of yellow colour!'. The AVP. line may be translated as: 'so that you may be free from troubles, also be not yellow'.

2.10 AVP. 1.29.3c reads: sarvās tā mṛśmaśākaram. Kashmirian version has mṛṣmṛṣākaram, and AVŚ. 5.23.8c sarvān ni maṣmaṣākaram. This onomatopoetic word has a number of variants: sarvaṃ taṃ masmasā kuru (TS. 4.1.10.3d, VS. 11.80d, ŚPBr. 6.6.3.10). For sarvāṃs tān mṛsmṛsā kuru, MS. 2.7.7d (84.3), Bloomfield+Edgerton: 2. sec. 242 reads mṛṣmṛṣā (v.l. mṛśmṛśā). KS. 16.7d and TĀr. 2.5.2d have maṣmaṣā. Bloomfield+Edgerton, 1.c. reads bhasmasā at the VS. line. Even Eggeling: 3.259 has the reading bhasmasā before him for ŚPBr. 'burn thou to ashes', but Sāyaṇa takes masmasā and rightly regards it as an onomatopoetic word. Monier-Williams: 750c also points out that bhasmasā is probably a wrong reading for masmasā. The word masmasā is read in the ūryādi-gaṇa 31.27 (on Pāṇ. 1.4.61). For the variants of this word, see Bloomfield+Edgerton: 2.

secs. 242, 292, 632. In this onomatopoetic word the *a* vowel is original whereas the *ṛ* is made to sound it Sanskritic. For variation between aorist indicative akaram and imperative kuru, see Bloomfield+Edgerton: 1. secs. 130, 304. 'Every one of them I have smashed (you smash).'

2.11 AVP. 1.32.3ab reads: yady arcir yadi vāsi dhūmaḥ śākalyeṣu yadi vā te janitram. Manuscripts read sakalyeṣu. AVŚ. 1.25.2ab has: yady arcir yadi vāsi śociḥ śakalyeṣi yadi vā te janitram. The Padapāṭha has śakaly-eṣí, which is extremely obscure and unintelligible. Paippalāda has the better reading śākalyeṣu 'among the shavings'. Sāyaṇa guesses it as locative of *śakalyeṣ-*, from *śakalya-* 'heap of shavings' and the root *iṣ-* 'to seek', and so an epithet of fire. Böhtlingk+Roth: 7.12 guess: 'following the shaving, i.e. glimmering'. Whitney: 25 renders: 'If thou art flame or if heat, or if thy birth-place seeks the shavings(?)'. Bloomfield 1897: 3 translates: 'Whether thou art flame, whether thou art heat, or whether from licking chips (of wood) thou hast arisen'. The AVP. line could be rendered as: 'If you are flame, or if smoke, or if your birth-place is among the shavings'.

2.12 AVP. 1.67.1cd has: tvaṃ tvā nitatni keśebhyo dṛṃhaṇāya khanāmasi. AVŚ. 6.136.1c reads tāṃ tvā (also Kashmirian version). The AVP. reading tvam for tām is unusual in this context. Whitney: 383 translates: 'thee here, O down-stretcher, we dig in order to fix the hair', while Bloomfield 1897: 31 renders: 'We dig thee up, O *nitatnī*, that thou mayest strengthen (the growth) of the hair'.

2.13 AVP. 1.68.4cd has: kurīram asya śīrṣaṇi kumbhaṃ cādhi ni dadhmasi. Kashmirian version reads: kumbaṃ cāvanidadhmasi. AVŚ. 6.138.3cd has: kurīram asya śīrṣaṇi kumbaṃ cādhi ni dadhmasi. One of the manuscripts in Vishva Bandhu's edition of the AtharvaVeda (Śaunaka) also reads kumbham. Sāyaṇa renders *kurīra-* as keśajāla 'a net of hair', and *kumba-* as 'its ornament' (tadābharaṇam). According to Whitney: 384 both words plainly signify some distinctively womanish head-dress or ornament. See ĀpŚrS. 10.9.5: atra patnī śirasi kumbakurīram adhyūhate. Monier-Williams: 292c renders this compound word as 'a kind of head-dress for women'. Cf. *kumbā-* f. (< *kumba-* + *-aṅi*, see Pāṇ. 3.3.105) 'a covering; a thick petticoat'. For *kumba-*, see Mayrhofer: 1.233-34, 3.676, also Turner, no. 3307, and for *kurīra-*, Mayrhofer: 1.236. See Bloomfield 1897: 108, 537. He renders the line as: 'A hood upon his head, and a hair--net do we place'. Here *kumba-* is the right form.

2.14 AVP. 1.80.5a reads: dyauṣ ṭe pitā pṛthivī mātā. AVŚ. 2.28.4a has: dyauṣ ṭvā pitā pṛthivī mātā. For transfer of epithet between dative and accusative forms, see Bloomfield et al: 3. sec. 489. A similar case is dyaus te dadātu pṛthivī pratigṛhṇātu, HGS. 1.13.17; ĀśvŚrS. 5.13.15 reads tvā for te. PGS. 3.15.22 has dyaus tvā dadātu pṛthivī tvā pratigṛhṇātu.

3.0 From this study of the nominal and pronominal variants, we can say that in many cases the PaippalādaSaṃhitā retains better and archaic forms. Some of the variants accepted by the Paippalāda are available in the ṚgVeda and also in some other Vedic texts.

References

Barret, LeRoy Carr. 1905-40. "The Kashmirian Atharva Veda," books 1 through 20. In: Journal of the American Oriental Society (New Haven) 26, 30, 32, 34 (Franklin Edgerton), 35, 37, 40-44, 46, 48, 47, 50, 58 – American Oriental Society vols. 9 & 18

Bhattacharya, Dipak. 1997. The Paippalāda-saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda. Vol. 1. Asiatic Society, Calcutta

Bhattacharyya, Durgamohan. 1964, 1970. Paippalāda Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda. 2 vols. Sanskrit College, Calcutta

Bloomfield, Maurice. 1897. Hymns of the Atharva-Veda. Oxford University Press

–. 1906. A Vedic Concordance. Publ. by Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

–, Edgerton, Franklin and Emeneau, M.B. 1930, 1932, 1934. Vedic Variants. Vols. 1 (M.B., F.E.), 2 (M.B., F.E.), 3 (M.B., F.E., M.B.E.). Linguistic Society of America, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

– and Garbe, Richard. 1901. The Kashmirian Atharva-Veda (School of the Pāippalādas). Reproduced by Chromophotography from the Manuscript in the University Library at Tübingen. Baltimore

Böhtlingk, Otto and Roth, Rudolf. 1855–1875. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch. 7 Theile. St. Petersburg

Eggeling, Julius. 1882-1900. The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa. 5 pts. Oxford

Hoffmann, Karl. 1968. "Remarks on the new edition of the Paippalāda-Saṃhitā". In: Indo-Iranian Journal (The Hague etc.) 11: 1-10

Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1956, 1963, 1976. Kurzgefaßtes Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen. 3 Bde. Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, Heidelberg

Monier-Williams, Monier. 1899. A Sanskṛit-English Dictionary. Oxford

Patyal, Hukam Chand. 2002. "Variants of verbal forms in the first kāṇḍa of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā". In: Subhāṣiṇī (Prof. Dr. Saroja Bhate Felicitation Volume), Pune: 292-98

Raghu Vira. 1936, 1940, 1942. Atharvaveda of the Paippalādas. Lahore

Turner, Ralph Lilley. 1966. A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages. Oxford University Press, London

Vishva Bandhu. 1961. Atharvavedasaṃhitā (Śaunaka) with Padapāṭha and Sāyaṇa's Commentary. Vol. 2, Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, Hoshiarpur

Whitney, William Dwight. 1905. Atharva-veda-saṃhitā. Vols. 1 (pp. i-clxii, 1-470), 2 (471-1046). Publ. by Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Notes on Conjugational Vowel-Gradation in the PaippalādaSaṃhitā of the AtharvaVeda

Dipak Bhattacharya

Abstract

Some apparently abnormal grammatical features noticed in the Paippalāda recension of the AtharvaVeda appear to be instances of archaism in vowel-gradation, all of which cannot be brushed away as AtharvaVedic "modernism". The verbs *aṃśāni* 'may I attain' and *dadau* 'was burnt' are only two instances. The paper deals with the problems connected with the words ṣaṣṭhīsyāmi-ṣaṣṭhyāṃśāni, AVP. 1.86.3 (a case of fluctuating ablaut) and dadau, AVP. 5.9.5 (hysterodynamism?).

Abbreviations

AiBr. = AitareyaBrāhmaṇa; AVP. = AtharvaVeda (Paippalāda); AVŚ. = AtharvaVeda (Śaunakīya); K. = Kashmir (ms. of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā); Or. = Orissa (mss. of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā); Pāṇ. = Pāṇini; ṚV. = ṚgVeda

1. ṣaṣṭhīsyāmi-ṣaṣṭhyāṃśāni, AVP. 1.86.3 – a case of fluctuating ablaut

The two words occur in the Oriya[1] and Kashmir manuscripts of PaippalādaSaṃhitā 1.86.3 respectively. The relevant hymn is not found outside the Paippalāda. In its first two verses the hymn praises three Rudras (vs. 1) and Indra and Agni (vs. 2) and at the same time asks these gods to drive away certain female evil beings called kaṇvā or kṛṇvā. The two readings under discussion occur in the third verse of the hymn, which runs as follows[2]:

1.86.3 vāstoṣ pate suprajasaḥ suvīrā
ṣaṣṭhīsyāmi śaradaḥ śatāni/
durvāstu kaṇvā abhi nir ṇudasva
suvāstv asmā̃ upa saṃ viśasva//

'O lord of the house! By the sixth (oblation) may I attain heroful hundreds of autumns endowed with good progeny. Push away the kaṇvās to a bad house! Provide us with a good house!'

There are quite a few problems with the translation. One is suprajasaḥ, which has to be read with śaradaḥ, both genitive singular. Similarly, suvīrā relates to śatāni. The word order is very unusual for the implied sentence. The first person of the agent has to be accepted as both Kashmir and Orissa have an *-i*-ending verb.

Secondly, the translation is based on the reading ṣaṣṭhyāṃśāni occurring in Kashmir instead of ṣaṣṭhīsyāmi of Orissa. Barret[3] reads K. as ṣaṣṭyāṃśāni but *ṣṭa* and *ṣṭha* are not easily distinguishable in K. The difference lies in the round nature of a loop below *ṣ* in *ṣṭha* and a break therein in the other. This is not clear when the two parts of the ligature are close as in our case. We may as well read it as ṣaṣṭhyāṃśāni, i.e. ṣaṣṭhyā and aṃśāni 'by the sixth may I attain!' (√*áṃś-* subjunctive 1/1). The first two verses speak of offering to five gods, three Rudras and Indra and Agni. The present verse speaks of the sixth offering to Vāstoṣpati.

A possible objection to such a resolution of the cluster may be that the root *áṃś-* is not found in conjugation. But the existence of a stem *áṃś-* is quite certain. We may refer to the view that *áṃśa-* 'share' is related to Greek *'óχγος* 'load' (Neisser[4] and Mayrhofer[5]). This should be based on an alternative fullgrade stem from the radicals *aś-* (*H*ṃ̀k'-*) 'to attain'. This matter was noted by Kurylowicz[6]. The following elaboration tries to clarify the position further.

The vowel gradation in the pair of roots *naś-/aś-* (*H*nek'-/ *H*ṃ̀k'-*)[7] (the letter H has been selected here to mean any laryngeal) takes effect between the second and the third radicals. But the fullgrade vowel may also come between the first two radicals giving rise to the root *áṃś-* (*H*enk'-*) 'to attain'[8]. This is understood as fluctuating ablaut here.

Kurylowicz makes observations on the relative chronology of the fluctuation. Like Wackernagel[9], he has a hypothesis of an original normal grade with two fullgrade vowels. Both mention earlier works on the subject which are, mostly, not available to me. The present paper, however, assumes a synchronic fluctuation in each stage as a working hypothesis. Whichever way the truth, the conclusions about aṃśāni are not affected thereby. But also see note 17 and the related text below.

The word "fluctuating" is used here after Wackernagel[10] who understood the phenomenon as "Schwankungen" between guṇa and samprasāraṇa. What actually occurs is just shifting of the fullgrade vowel within the radical stem. With nominal declension such occurrence within the stem would be called "proterodynamism" for which see the second section of the paper.

There are many examples of variety in stem-formation from such shift of the fullgrade vowel; cf. Avestan *zimā-*, *zyāδ-* 'winter',

Greek *χιών* and *χείμα*, Vedic *himá-*, *hemantá-* 'id.'. The occurrence of conjugated forms in such cases of fluctuation is not uncommon. Cf. *vetsyati* and *vivyādha*, both having the same weak base in √*vidh-* 'to pierce'[11], apart from *dadarśa*, *adrākṣīt* and √*dṛś-* 'to see'. So we can also get *aṃśāni* (present subjunctive 1/1) 'may I attain' or *āṃśāni* (perfect subjunctive 1/1). The lengthening in perfect may be caused by the reduplicative *a* (**e*[12]) before a laryngeal, i.e. *HeHenk'*[13] (cf. *tatanāma*). The initial *'ó* of the Greek word should be an instance of metaphony.

Semantically √*áṃś-* 'to attain' should be related to *áṃśa-* 'share' just as √*bhaj-* 'to obtain' is related to *bhāgá-* 'share'. Cf. ṚV. 1.68.4 bhájanta víśve devatváṃ nāma 'they all obtained the name of divinity'[14]; also see 5.57.5 amṛ́taṃ nā́ma bhejire[15].

Among other problems, the said fluctuation does not itself solve the problem of the stem *anáś-* in *anáśāmahai* (ṚV. 8.27.22). But transfer with stems with medial nasal is well attested. Cf. *vīnasti* (Gāthic Avestan) and *vindāite* (subjunctive, Younger Avestan), and Vedic *vindate*. A similar relation is to be assumed between *aṃś-/ anaś-* (rudh- class, nasal infixing) and *aś-/naś-* (aorist)[16]. This precludes the necessity of a root with two syllables[17].

2. dadau, AVP. 5.9.5 – hysterodynamism?

The hymn is against sadānvā-s and kaṇva-s/kaṇvā-s. The verse runs as follows:

Or. viterupanthā śvaśre bibhide te 'gadohanī/
dadhau te adya gauḥ kaṇve parehy avaraṃ mṛṇe//

K. vitenmanthāścaśirevitade * agadohini
dadau * abhya * * * * vṛṇe/

'Your churners immediately fell apart, your medicine-gatherer split apart, your cow was burnt today, O Kaṇvā, go far away down, you destroyer!'

The readings are corrupt. The translation required the following reconstruction made with help from both the versions: vi te nu manthāś +śaśrire bibhide te 'gadohanī/ dadau te etc.

Among the problem readings in the verse, mṛṇe (K. vṛṇe) vocative/1 is the first instance of the unprefixed feminine stem. There is nothing to doubt its correctness and authenticity though the nominal stem has the conjugational temporal suffix *-nā-* (**neH*).

dadau (K.)/dadhau (Or.) is more difficult and offers more than one problem. The translation implies the root *du-* or *dū-* 'to burn'. The verb is well attested but its antiquity has been doubted and it has been regarded as an instance of AtharvaVedic modernism[18]. But since the antiquity of √*du-/dū-* 'to burn' is established by ṚV. 10.34.5 daviṣāṇi 'may I burn!' (= √*du-/dū-* iṣ-aorist subjunctive 1/1), it is not necessary to find any modernism here.

The verb *du-/dū-* means non-sacrificial burning only, often forest fire. Hoffmann[19] noted the root *du-* in this sense in *daviṣāṇi*. *daviṣāṇi* is quite differently interpreted by other scholars, sometimes from √*dīv-* which fails with the form, sometimes from √*du-/dū-* in a different sense, which fails with the meaning. Hoffmann's explanation satisfies both the form and the meaning.

While the sense of the verb *du-/dū-*, thus, quite fits into our verse, the form *dadau* is unsual. The expected form was *dudāva*. A fully satisfactory explanation will be wanting but the following is put for consideration.

According to the accepted view the original Proto-Indo-European perfect reduplicative vowel was **e*. Such a state is inferable from the usual Greek perfect, e.g. *λελοιπα* (<*λειπω*)[20], *βέβηκα* (<*βαίνω*). In Sanskrit when the radical vowel is *i/u*, this itself forms the perfect reduplicative vowel as in *tutóda* (<√*tod-/tud-*), *jigāya* (<√*jé-/ji-*) and *uvāca* (<√*vác-/uc-*). But the older state is reflected in forms like *tastháu*[21] and *papāda* where the weak grade has no vowel (**st*H- <**sta*H-, **pd-* <*pad-*). So also with roots with the vowels *r̥, l̥, m̥* and *n̥* The perfect reduplicative syllable of Old Indo-Aryan (and Old Iranian as far as applicable) roots in *r̥, l̥* is *a*. That it comes from the PIE. palatal fullgrade vowel **e* is easily inferable. For, the palatalisation of velars in the reduplicative syllable, e.g. in *jabhāra*, *jagāma* etc., proves that the vowel of the reduplicative syllable was **e* which was then changed to *a* as one would have it in Indo-Iranian, and not *a* as the Indo-Iranian replacement of *m̥* and *n̥* under some conditions.

The *a* of *dadau* from √*du-/dū-* is thus not beyond explanation, though highly irregular in normal Vedic. But the actual position of the PaippalādaSaṃhitā in Vedic chronology is not yet determined. It will not be unreasonable to expect such attempts as are being made here to serve as inductive steps. Misplaced weight on "modernism" in the AtharvaVeda, which in any case concerns the Śaunakīya version only[22], may make it appear naïve to expect that a hypothetical and at the same time primitive feature of Indo-European will appear in the AVP. perfect reduplication, but the following facts need to be noted.

There are two instances of the occurrence of *-a* as the perfect reduplicative vowel when the radical vowel is *ū*, namely *babhūva* etc. and *sasūva* etc.; also note *śaśayāná-* where the radical vowel is *ī*. As far as my knowledge goes, no better explanation of the phenomenon than the one given by Brugmann[23] more than a hundred years ago – that these "three retained the *a* (<PIE. **e*) in the reduplicative" – has yet been put forward. Though the phenomenon has not been fully explained, its underlying law applied to √*dū-* will yield **dadūva*. Now this hypothetical form stands in a variational relation with *dadau* which requires close attention.

The connection of the PIE. accent with its vowel gradation[24] resulted in the shifting of fullgrade vowels, it being a notable feature of Old Indo-Aryan. The phenomenon is mostly observable with athematic stems which have no fixed accent, e.g. in the opposition of *kr̥ṇó-ti* and *kr̥ṇv-ánti* etc. in conjugation, and between *sānu-ḥ* and *snó-ḥ* and *dyáu-ḥ* and *div-áḥ* in declension. The variation may occur within the same stem (*sānuḥ* : *snóḥ* = "proterodynamism")[25] or between the stem and the suffix (*dyáuḥ* : *diváḥ* = "hysterodynamism")[26] in a single paradigmatic structure. With verbs the phenomenon may occur in the same tense and mood (*bubódha* : *bubudhátur*). The variational relation between the fullgrade vowels belonging to forms of athematic nominal declension with sarvanāmasthāna[27] endings and those with asarvanāmasthāna endings is very well-known. The variation between the stem and the suffix, e.g. *dyáu-ḥ* : *div-áḥ*, *rā́jan* : *rā́jñ-aḥ*, *kr̥ṇó-ti* : *kr̥ṇu-táḥ*, etc., calls for attention here. This has already been subjected to analysis by scholars.

The two terms "proterodynamism" (intra-stem fluctuation) and "hysterodynamism" (fluctuation between stem-vowel and suffix-vowel) were coined for ablaut fluctuation in nominal declension first by Pedersen[28] and then shown in the Vedic declension by Kuiper[29]. Narten[30] tried to show some traces of "proterodynamism" in the athematic conjugation of some Vedic (also Avestic and Greek) verbs like *śáye, tákṣati* (3rd pl.) etc., but this was opposed by Insler[31]. Narten shows the co-occurrence of the accented fullgrade stem-vowel and the unaccented suffixal weak vowel where normally the weak stem is expected. The said controversy is outside the scope of our present discussion.

Even without going into controversy one may note that *dadau* and **dadūvatur* (cf. *babhūvátur*, ṚV. 6.62.5) stand in the same relation as holds between *kṛṇóti* and *kṛṇvánti*. *dadau* as opposed to *babhūva* and *babhūvátur* (or **dadūva* and **dadūvatur*) has lost the suffixal *-a* which has resulted in the shifting of the fullgrade vowel to the stem, just as in *paśo-ḥ*, AVŚ. 19.31.8, the suffixal *-a-* clings to the stem in opposition to *paśv-áḥ*, ṚV. 1.67.3 where it appears in the sufix. That is to say, *dadau* is hysterodynamically related to a hypothetical form which exists for another closely similar root.

It must be added that we hardly get any help from the accent. On the one hand the AVP. mss. are unaccented excepting on rare occasions, when K. shows accented text, often erroneously. Secondly, and this is more important, it is a well-accepted fact that the position of accents had been disturbed even in the Primitive Indo-European stage so that the original position, i.e. the accent on the fullgrade vowel, is often not reflected in the Vedas. This may explain the medial accent of *babhūva* 3/1.

dadau is thus understandable. But two more points may be raised here. Is *dadau* <√*dū-* a freak or the remnant of an authentic trait? An affirmative answer will bring in the closely connected question – which one of the two, *dadau* and **dadūva*, as inferable from *babhūva*, might be the older?

Now, in conjugation, normally the singular number gets the strong stem, e.g. in 3/1 *tuṣṭāva* as contrasted to 3/2 *tuṣṭuvátur*. It is only natural to expect that the strong stem *dadau* would appear in 3/1. √*bhū-* and √*sū-*, 3/1 *babhūva* and *sasūva*, on this ground, may seem to be replacements of **sasau* and **babhau*, both "hysterodynamically" related to their non-singular forms.

The above connot be proved by external evidences. In fact, the information is so meagre and things had so much changed in Greek that only the Avesta, apart from the Veda, may be of help. So far as I am aware, much progress has not been made on the origin of the final *-au* in perfect indicative 3/1 of *-a*-ending roots, since Brugmann[32] made his observations. He asserted the obscure nature of the origin with vague suggestions about *pa-prā* (in ṚV. 1.69.1, from √*prā-* perfect 3/1) and Avestic *daδa* being the original forms and the possibility of *-u* being affixed to the final *-ā* as a particle as sometimes suggested. He also spoke of the view which connected *papráu* with Latin *plēv-ī*, *jajñáu* with Latin *nóv-ī* and *tastháu* with *sthūrá-* and *sthāvira-*. This view prevailed with the addition of the laryngeal element by Kurylowicz[33], i.e. showing *dadáu* as from **de--dóH-u*. But Renou[34] made some original comments. The final should have been *-ā* (= end of stem) + *-a* (= suffix), which Renou thought was attested in the ṚV. hapax *pa-prā* (above; contrast *paprátur*, 8.41.9). Brugmann (above) had already hinted at this. As for the *-áu* of roots ending in *-ā* he made two suggestions. This could have been influenced by the *-ā/-au* variation in nominal 1st and 2nd case-ending dual or could hide a base in *-u* ("... lointain substrat d'une base annexe en *-u-* ..."). For this he had a theory of *a>u* ablaut[35]. Strange though it may seem, it should be clear that the AVP. word *dadau* from √*dū-* lends some support to Renou's last observation.

If *dadau* from √*dū-* has an authentic trait and is older than **dadūva*, at some point of time, we have to infer, the final *-au* of perfect 3/1 indicative of roots ending in *-ū* was transferred to *-ā-*-ending roots. With the former this led to the generation of new forms like *dudāva*. This could have happened when strict rules of PIE. accent were on decline.

Post-script

Karl Hoffmann, Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik (note 7 below), pp. 597ff. & 606, n. 1, speaks of the existence of more inflexional categories than the two fluctuating types mentioned by Kuiper. He understands acrodynamic inflexion with acrostatic accent as featured in the constant accent of the initial syllable causing the weak grade

in the suffix, e.g. in *ácittī*, and seems to explain the forms discussed by Narten (note 30) by that. Hoffmann does not deny fluctuating ablaut as a PIE. feature. Different is Raimo Anttila's conservative thesis (Proto Indo-European Schwebeablaut, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1969), denying the existence of a PIE. "mechanism" for the shifting of the fullgrade vowel. Apparently, the existence of three radicals and the absence of any "mechanism" for determining the ideal place of an accented fullgrade vowel (also see note 9) in between are not sufficient. Without any attempt to determine the truth of that as a general theory, some comments may be made.

Anttila's theory renders the parallelism between *áṃśa-* and *'όγχος* ineffective as these would be seen as unconnected. But, one may question, "Was fluctuating ablaut a reality in Old Indo-Iranian?" A linguistic phenomenon may be a synchronic one limited by time. Fossilised dialectal survivals will not be abnormal even in such cases. For this, one must take into account AVP. 9.28.6c striyas te anyā māchāñchur (K. maśchāṃsur). māchāñchur is to be taken as a corruption of māchāṃśur (mā achā aṃśur). That will give a plausible meaning 'Let other women not come hither for you'. The root appears as *achā naś-* in the ṚgVeda. But *√naś-* can give only *naśur* or *aśur* (*H*ṇśur*). Only a strong grade form (cf. *adarśur*, AiBr.) of *aṃś-* can give *aṃśur*. That this is dialectal survival can be faintly guessed from the occurrence of conjugated forms of *aṃś-* only in exclusive AVP. hymns.

One might appreciate the fact that the proposal of *aṃś-* as resulting from fluctuating vowel gradation has been made not to show fluctuating ablaut as a wide PIE. phenomenon but to solve a text-critical exegetical problem. Before everything one must consider how a different solution can be offered for ṣaṣṭhyāṃśāni.

I should also point to some further archaic features in *dadau*. It has to be noted that with *dadau* we are left with a conjugated verb without a suffix. This would be unusual for Old Indo-Aryan, though, theoretically, there is nothing wrong in suffixless inflexion which occurs in Sanskrit nominal declension. There are three possibilities here:

i. My judgement is wrong.

ii. An archaic state of affairs when suffixless conjugational vowel gradation took place is reflected here.

iii. There was an initial laryngeal in the termination – only laryngeal in the weak grade – which has eventually been lost. This goes against Kurylowicz's 1927 thesis that forms like *jagāma* (active perfect indicative 3/1) as distinguished from *jagama* (do. 1/1) are accounted for by the absence and presence of a suffix-initial laryngeal in the two cases respectively. The laryngeal, according to that, coming after **g"om-* closed the syllable preventing the operation of Brugmann's law in 1/1, and its absence in 3/1 facilitated the said operation. The theory was accepted by Kuiper and applied, too, in his expositions of the laryngeal theory. But later Kurylowicz himself withdrew (1956, L'Apophonie en Indoeuropéen, p. 337) the theory as that would have prevented lengthening in *jajāna* too, since *jan* (**ǵen*H) ended in a laryngeal. This means that a laryngeal, unlike other consonants, does not close a syllable.

This, however, only removes a hindrance to the acceptance of a suffix-initial laryngeal in active perfect indicative 3/1. No positive evidence is known to me. However, it must be admitted that it is very difficult to guess about the PIE. position of the perfect terminations from a comparative study. It is a known fact that the perfect terminations had many new developments in individual languages.

I am grateful to Professor Johanna Narten who pointed to me Anttila's views and sent to me some relevant pages from Anttila's book. She also sent to me some relevant pages from C.H. Werba's Verba Indoarica, Wien 1997 and from M.J. Kümmel's Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen, Wiesbaden 2000. The last two publications were not even known to me. Since she writes in German, Professor Narten has not been widely read in India, though, like her teacher late Professor Karl Hoffmann, she is one of the most acclaimed authorities on Indo-European philology. And this is not the first time that she has helped me (and also others), this time ignoring serious personal inconveniences.

Notes

[1] Manuscripts discovered by Durgamohan Bhattacharyya in 1959. Cf. the Introduction to his edition (Kāṇḍa 1, Sanskrit College, Calcutta 1964) and also the

one of the new edition mentioned in note 2.

[2] The reading given below is from the printed text, i.e. The Paippalāda-saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda 1, 1-15 kāṇḍas, ed. Dipak Bhattacharya, Asiatic Society, Calcutta 1997. Only the important manuscript variants have been shown in this paper. Other variants can be checked from the critical apparatus of the said edition.

[3] L.C. Barret, "The Kashmirian Atharva Veda", book 1, in Journal of the American Oriental Society 26, 1905.

[4] W. Neisser, Zum Wörterbuch des Ṛgveda, Erstes Heft, Leipzig 1924.

[5] M. Mayrhofer, Kurzgefaßtes Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen, Heidelberg 1956-80.

[6] J. Kurylowicz, Études Indo-Européennes 1, Krakow 1935, pp. 31, 78 etc.

[7] Apart from Kurylowicz, K. Hoffmann, Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 2, 1952/1957, pp. 121-28 (repr. Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik, herausg. von (Ms.) J. Narten, Wiesbaden 1976-77, pp. 358-64), made some important observations.

[8] See J. Kurylowicz, loc. cit.

[9] J. Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik 1, Göttingen 1896, pp. 100-01.

[10] Op. cit., p. 69.

[11] J. Wackernagel, op. cit., p. 69 for both *hima-* etc. and *vyadh-*. He gives more examples.

[12] See infra with notes 20, 21 below.

[13] Cf. Kurylowicz, op. cit., p. 31 where the *ā* of *ānaṭ* has been explained that way.

[14] H. Oldenberg, Vedic Hymns, Sacred Books of the East Series 46, 1897, p. 64.

[15] We may note in passing that in the Pāṇinian system *naś-/laś-* could have been regarded as a samprasāraṇa type of ablaut by virtue of its being the elision of a "following vowel" as in *ya/va>i/u* and the *áṃś-/laś-* variation as guṇa-type. But they are not so much in discussion in the Pāṇinian system.

[16] Transfer is proposed by Sāyaṇa from *aś-* (su- class) to **anś-↔anaś-* (rudh- class): aśnoter loṭi vyatyayena śnam.

[17] See note 9 and the related text.

[18] J. Wackernagel-L. Renou, Introduction Générale, Altindische Grammatik 1, Göttingen 1955, p. 65, note 183.

[19] K. Hoffmann, Kuhns Zeitschrift 79, 1965, pp. 177ff. (Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik (note 7 above), pp. 168ff.) makes a long discussion with references.

[20] C.D. Buck, Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin, Chicago-Illinois 1952 (fifth impression), p. 287, §404.

[21] K. Brugmann, A Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages, vol. 4, tr. R.S. Conway-W.H.D. Rouse, 1892, p. 387, §846 and p. 399, §851. The position of Burrow (T. Burrow, The Sanskrit Language, London 1955, p. 340) is not different.

[22] See note 18 above.

[23] Op. cit., p. 399.

[24] T. Burrow, op. cit., p. 110.

[25] See infra and notes 28-31 below.

[26] See infra and notes 28-31 below.

[27] In Western works one gets the terms "nominative and accusative" for sarvanāmasthāna. Cf. Kuiper, Notes on Vedic Noun-Inflexion (note 29 below), p. 1. But the second case-ending plural has to be omitted. The term sarvanāmasthāna is Pāṇini's and excludes the second case-ending plural. For neuter stems, the first two plural endings are sarvanāmasthāna. See Pāṇ. 1.1.42-43.

[28] H. Pedersen, La Cinquième Déclinaison Latine, Copenhagen 1926, passim.

[29] F.B.J. Kuiper, Notes on Vedic Noun-Inflexion, Amsterdam 1942. He gives a short history of the development of the idea.

[30] J. Narten, "Zum "proterodynamischen" Wurzelpräsens", Pratidānam, Den Haag-Paris 1969, pp. 9-19 (repr. Kleine Schriften, Bd. 1, herausg. von Marcos Albino und M. Fritz, Wiesbaden 1995, pp. 97-107).

[31] S. Insler, Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 30, 1972, pp. 55-64.

[32] Op. cit., pp. 402-03, §852.

[33] Études Indo-Européennes 1, p. 39.

[34] Grammaire de la Langue Védique, Lyon-Paris 1952, p. 278.

[35] Ibid., p. 26.

Colophon

This paper incorporates some points raised in a presentation made at the International Seminar on "AtharvaVedic Studies", Department of Sanskrit, Jadavpur University, Calcutta on 16.02.2001.

Śaunaka vis-à-vis Paippalāda: Variants of Some Words of Austric Origin

Abhijit Ghosh

Abstract

Discussion of a few AtharvaVedic words of a group referring to 'snake, etc.', where the Paippalāda variants are helpful in establishing a possible Austric origin of the same: *āligī-*, *víligī-*, *urugūlā-*. [India, Vedic Philology, non-Aryan elements in Sanskrit]

Abbreviations

AV. = AtharvaVeda; AVP. = AtharvaVeda (Paippalāda); AVPr. = AtharvaVedaPrātiśākhya; BhP. = BhāgavataPurāṇa; Buddh. = Buddhist (Hybrid Sanskrit literature); BhvPr. = BhāvaPrakāśa; Car. = Caraka; comm. = commentator(s); GGS. = GobhilaGṛhyaSūtra; ep. = epic; Kaut. = Kauṭalya; Kāvy. = Kāvya literature; KśkS. = KauśikaSūtra; lex. = lexicon, lexical; MhBh. = MahāBhārata; PñcT. = PañcaTantra; PS. = PaippalādaSaṃhitā; ṚV. = ṚgVeda; ṚV-Kh. = ṚgVeda-Khila; sch. = scholiast(s); SdhnM. = SādhanaMālā; SprnA. = SuparṇĀdhyāya; ŚS. = ŚaunakaSaṃhitā; Susr. = Suśruta; TS. = TaittiriyaSaṃhitā; Up. = Upaniṣad; VṣṇP. = VișṇuPurāṇa; YV. = YajurVeda

§1 It has now been proved beyond doubt that the Aryans were foreigners to India and Sanskrit has borrowed words from non-Aryan languages right from the ṚgVedic period. The case for Munda borrowings appears more prominent in the ṚgVeda, than the evidence for Dravidian ones (especially prominent in later Sanskrit). The eastward movement of the Aryans is clear in the AtharvaVeda, and the region of the Munda-speaking peoples extended in the Vedic times much farther north-westwards than their present pockets, while the original culture of the Proto-Australoids was significantly higher than that of their present descendants.

§2 Przyluski, followed immediately by Chatterji, Gonda and Kakati, and later to some extent by Burrow, studied the Austro-Asiatic influence on Old Indo-Aryan (including Vedic), oftener than not with the help of Farther Indian languages. But Kuiper, who has done the most extensive researches on Munda-Austro-Asiatic influence on Sanskrit vocabulary, tried to prove that it is untrue that the majority of the Austro-Asiatic loanwords in Sanskrit have no connections with Munda, though the influence of Austro-Asiatic on

Sanskrit was demonstrated mostly with the help of lexical materials taken from languages outside India (1948: 5); to his school may be said to belong later scholars like Mayrhofer, Berger and Pinnow, who made significant contributions on the subject.

§3 Though many of Kuiper's etymologies are quite plausible, nearly everything can be demonstrated by a purely mechanical application of his "sound laws", as the derivates from one and the same root have often widely divergent forms (o.c.: 7). Due to the profound influence of the surrounding powerful Indo-European and Dravidian linguistic families, the Munda languages have developed into a type of language rather different from the original Austro-Asiatic one, with many loans at the cost of numerous common Austric elements.

§4 The present writer (Ghosh 2000) tried to prove that Austric loans in Old Indo-Aryan cannot still often be determined without the help of lexical materials from Farther Indian, even Austronesian languages, free from the influences of Indo-European and Dravidian. This paper is a discussion of a few AtharvaVedic words of a group referring to 'snake, etc.', where the Paippalāda variants helped to establish a possible Austric origin of the same.

ā́ligī-

§5 The hapax *ā́ligī-* and *víligī-* occur in a formula against snake-poison, AV. 5.13, vs. 7:

> ā́ligī ca víligī ca pitā́ ca mātā́ ca/
> vidmá vaḥ sarváto bándhv árasāḥ kíṃ karișyatha//

They refer presumably to 'kinds of serpent' (so Griffith: 1.27 fn., vd. also Böhtlingk+Roth: 1.703, 6.1168), but are not identified. Their forms apparently suggest that they are connected, but how they should be analysed is not sure and their etymology is unknown. The PadaPāṭha analyses: *ā́-ligī*, *ví-ligī*, and Whitney: 243 conjectures that the wholly obscure words might also be nominative masculine of stems in *-in-*, but their accent is against it. Debrunner's attempt (p. 403) to connect the both with *liṅg-* 'to clasp' (with *ā́-*, *ví-*) fails to convince (vd. Mayrhofer 1992: 176). Tilak: 33-36, 38f. (vd. Régamey: 452) tried to point out Chaldean influence on some names in the

hymn, *ā́ligī-* according to him (pp. 33ff.) being an Akkadian word (*víligī-* is the name of an Asura of Assyrian mythology (Akkadian) and occurs in the Sumerian languages, though *ā́ligī-* is wanting there, l.c.); Agrawala's explanation (p. 2, Akkadian) is also fanciful (vd. Mayrhofer: 3.220 s.v. *víligī*). R.N. Dandekar (personal communion 1971-72) thinks both to be some evil-spirits and compares, unreasonably however, Hindi *alā-balā*, Urdu-Hindi *alāy-bilāy* (dialectal) 'disaster; misfortune; troubles brought about by power of evil spirits', Marathi *alāī-balāī, alāy-balāy* f., pl. *alāyā-balāyā* (from Urdu-Hindi), f. *āḷāviḷā*, 'all pains, trouble, and affliction', to which one should add Bengali *ālāi-bālāi* 'disease and mishap; rubbish', all ultimately from Persian *ālāy* (in compounds) 'defiling; defiles' + Arabic *balā'* 'calamity; affliction; evil'.

§6 It appears that the elements *hā́l-, kā́l-, kā́r-, kṛ-, *kir-, kū́l-, kur-, ā́r-, ā́l-, ur-, ul-, gal-, gar-, gol-, śar-, sā́r-, śír-, śíl-*, etc., etc. ($\begin{Bmatrix} k/g \\ h \\ ś \\ \text{zero} \end{Bmatrix} V \begin{Bmatrix} l \\ r \end{Bmatrix}$- : V = vowel) found in numerous Sanskrit words for 'poison(ous)', 'poisonous plants', 'venomous or supposed to be venomous animals', 'poisonous chemicals' etc., which are often reduplicated, are from the Austro-Asiatic source, vd. Bagchi: xxvii, Kuiper 1955: 167f. Vd. Rönnow, passim for names, beginning with *kir-, kar-, kur-, kr-, kul-, kol-, kal-* etc., of peoples, tribes, professions etc. who are associated with serpents; cf. especially pp. 153, 156. From Sanskrit cf. such words like *halika-* m. 'cert. serpent demon', MhBh., *hālāhala-* m. 'partic. poisonous plant', Kauṭ. (?), BhvPr., n. 'certain deadly poison', Suśr.+, *halāhala-* m.n. 'sort of deadly poison', Kāvy., PñcT.+, 'kind of snake', lex., with which Böhtlingk+Roth: 2.159 and Kuiper 1955: 167 compared *kalākula-* n. '(kind of) poison', lex. and *kulika-* m. 'kind of poison', Galanos (also 'one of eight chiefs of serpent-race', ep.+), *kalihārī-* f. 'Methonica superba', BhvPr., with lex. variant *kalikārī-* and synonyms like *halī-* etc., *karkoṭaká-* m. 'cert. Nāga', ṚV-Kh., MhBh.+, *karkoṭa-* n. 'partic. poisonous fruit', Suśr., *karkaṭī-* f. 'snake', lex., *kṛkaṇṭhaka-* m. 'cert. venomous animal', Car., *kṛkalāsá-, °ilāsa-* m. 'chameleon', YV.+ (*°ulāsa-*, lex.:sch.), *kola⌊-śimbī⌋-* f. 'cowach', BhvPr., *hala-golaka-* m. 'kind of insect', MhBh. (with which Böhtlingk+Roth: 7.1567 compared *gala-golin-* m. [or *°ī-* f.] 'kind of snake', Suśr.), *śarkóṭa-* m. 'partic. poisonous snake or scorpion', AV., AVP. (Orissa), etc., etc. From Austro-Asiatic, cf., e.g. Semang *hāle'* (*hali'*), Pangan ⌊*jekop*⌋ *halek*, etc. 'snake' ('cobra'), Santali *kal* 'poison; snake', Mon *klǎn* (*klán*), Cham *klan*, Bahnar ⌊*bih*⌋ *klán*, Stieng *klán* etc. 'snake, spec. python', etc. etc. (Skeat+Blagden: 2.719a S321). For *k/g* : *h*, a Proto-Munda phenomenon inherited from primary/primitive Austric, cf. *lā́ṅgala-* n. 'plough', ṚV.+ : *hala-* m.n. 'plough', GGS.+, and Kuiper 1948: 7 with ref.; cf. also *kulāhaka-* m. 'chameleon; lizard', lex. : *halāhala-* m. 'spec. of lizard', ib.

§7 Now, minus the initial consonant are attested, among others, *ā́la-* n. 'spawn; any discharge of poisonous matter from venomous animals', KśkS., Suśr., found as early as in ā́lāktā (iṣuḥ) 'poisoned (arrow)', in vs. 15 of ṚV. 6.75 (appended hymn), for which non-Aryan origin has been suspected by Ammer: 132, Kuiper 1955: 167f., Mayrhofer: 1.79f. s.vv. *ālam, ā́lāktaḥ*, 1992: 175f. s.v. *ā́lākta-*; cf. *alasā́lā-* f., AV., explained as '[Pflanze] mit wirkungslosem Gift' by Hoffmann: 11ff. Cf. also *āra-* n. 'sting', comm. on TS., *ala-* as found in *ala-gardá-* m. 'water-serpent', SprṇA., Suśr., *ala-gardā-* f. 'large poisonous leech', Suśr., Pali *ala-gadda-*, 'kind of snake', with a synonym *kālaka-* m. in lex., *alasa-* m. 'cert. small poisonous animal', Suśr., *āluka-* m. 'Śeṣa', lex., cf. also *ala-* n. 'sting', lex., Pali *āḷaka-* m. 'sting, etc.', possibly *ali-* m. 'bee', Kāvy., *āli-* m. 'scorpion', lex. (also Pali). And there should be little doubt that the element *āl-* is contained in *ā́ligī-*, in whichever way it is analysed. So, Kuiper's analysis of *alagardá-* as *alag-ardá-*, with the first segment of which he connects *ā́lig*[-]*ī-* (1991: 47, 60, 74) does not seem convincing.

víligī-

§8 Now *víligī-* cannot be separated from the preceding *ā́ligī-* but it is difficult to analyse it in conformity with the latter. In fact, Scheftelowitz: 250 suggested an isolated Indo-European etymology of *víligī-*, together with *vī́ṇā-* f. 'lute', YV.+, *vellati* 'staggers', Kāvy.+, *veṇī́-* f. 'braid of hair', ṚV. (ifc.)+, *veṇú-, véṇu-* m.

'bamboo; reed', ṚV.+, 'flute', ep.+ : this is, however, far-fetched. The Orissan Paippalāda reading *āliki-*, and especially the Kashmirian Paippalāda *ālakā-*, for *ā́ligī-*, would very much seem to point to the right direction, but they are not helpful in the case of *víligī-*. AVP. (Orissa) 8.2.6 has *vili-* for *víligī-*, and the corresponding Kashmirian line is very corrupt in this regard: ālakā ca vyaca luptvā yas te mātā. But the expression ālakaṃ vyālakaṃ at AVP. (Orissa) 9.10.10, with a reference to *viṣa-* in the same verse (ālakaṃ vyālakaṃ vyāvaṃ jālma jigīmahe/ jaradviṣaṃ yuvābhiṣak vayam it sāsahāmahai//), at Bhattacharya: 596, leaves little doubt that *ā́ligī-*, *víligī-* are to be analysed as *ā́l-ig-ī-*, *víl-ig-ī-* (for **vy-ā̀ligī-*), and not as *ā́-ligī-*, *ví-ligī-*. This hymn is also against (snake-)poison, and has many other expressions in common with Śaunakīya 5.13, like the reference to *taimāta-* (at 3c : ŚS. 6a); śakuntikā me abravīd viṣa-puṣpaṃ dhayantikā, 8ab (: ŚS. karṇā́ śvāvít tád abravīd girér avacarantikā́, 9ab); arasaṃ viṣam (at 5d, 6d, 7d, 8d, 12def. : ŚS. 8d, 10c, 11c, also 9d arasátamaṃ viṣám); .. viṣaṃ .. vācā dūṣayāmasi (at 2cd), atho viṣasya svailasya samānīṃ vācam agrabham (4cd) : cf. ŚS. 1b vácobhir ugra'ir ní riṇāmi te viṣám, 3b ugréṇa te vácasā bādha ā́d u te; agrabham (at 4d : ŚS. 1c, 2b, 3c, also 2c gr̥hṇā́mi); yāvat sūryo vitapati yāvac cābhivipaśyati/ tenāham indradattena kr̥ṇomy arasaṃ viṣam//, 12a-d : ŚS. ahám tám asya nŕ̥bhir agrabhaṃ rásaṃ/ támasa iva jyótir úd etu sū́ryaḥ//, 3cd (a nice simile). The initial segment *vy-* can be attested even in the corrupt Kashmirian line ālakā ca vyaca etc. Cf. now *vy-ā̀la-* adj. 'auf beiden Seiten mit Gift bestreut', 'Arsenik auf allen Seiten habend' (vd. Lüders: 318-21), AV. 5.22.6, and perhaps *vyāla-* m. 'snake', ep.+, *vyālī-* f. 'female snake', ib. (cf. ā́ligī ca víligī ca pitā́ ca mātā́ ca AV. 5.13.7ab), *vyālaka-* m. 'serpent', MhBh. For the change ŚS. *g* : PS. *k*, vd. *urugū́lā-* : *udakūlā-* below.

urugū́lā-

§9 This hapax legomenon occurs at AV. 5.13.8:

urugū́lāyā duhitā́ jātā́ dāsy ásiknyā/

pratáṅkaṃ dadrúṣīṇāṃ sárvāsām arasáṃ v̥ṣé́m//

This has been quoted by the commentator to AVPr. 3.72 in the form *urū-gūlā-* : so the ms.; Lanman pleads for *urú-gūlā-*. The meaning of the word and the snake indicated being unknown (Griffith: 1.209 fn.), Whitney: 243 renders 'broad-knobbed one (?)', but only "since something had to be done to make the line translatable". He conjectures a relationship of *-gūla-* to *guḍa-*, *gola-*, doubted by Mayrhofer 1992: 228. Tilak: 33ff. (cf. also Régamey: 452) tried to associate the word (Akkadian, Chaldean) with Babylonian mythology (very doubtful, vd. Mayrhofer: 1.109). Agrawala's etymology (p. 2) also fails to convince (vd. Mayrhofer 1992: 228 with ref.). Kuiper 1959: 211 suspects the formative element to be *-ūla-*, and prefers to connect the root-word with *urága-*, completely questionably, vd. Mayrhofer 1992: 225, 228 s.vv. *urága-*, *urugū́lā-* with ref. Since connection of *urága-* Up., SprṇA., Suśr.+, also *uraṅga(ma)-* BhP. but *urógama-* SprṇA., m. 'serpent(-demon); snake', with *úras-* 'breast' is phonetically problematic (vd. also Mayrhofer 1992: 225 with ref.), Richter: 199 considered *ura(ṅ)ga-* as a possible loanword from a non-Indo-European source. The first element of *urúga-* m. 'serpent', SprṇA. or *urugū́lā-* is also probably not *urú-* 'wide', vd. Mayrhofer, l.c., 228 s.v. *urugū́lā-*. The present author (2000: 98) hinted at a connection of *urága-*, *urugū́lā-*, *udakūlā-* §12 (taking *-ūla-* as the formative element, after Kuiper), with a group of Austro-Asiatic words for 'snake' like Sakai *ulār*, Orang Laut *ulèkh*, Malay *ular* (this being the generic added before the names of numerous species of snakes) : this is hereby withdrawn.

§10 Now, the meaning 'poison(ous)' is associated with a few words with *ur-*, *ul-*, which may be to *kur-*, *kul-* what *al-*, *ar-* is to *kal-*, *kar-*. Cf. *úlūka-* m. 'cert. Nāga', SprṇA., Buddh. lex., as well as *ulūta-* m. 'Boa constrictor', lex., related with the people-names (m.pl.) MhBh. *ulūta-*, VṣṇP. *ulūṭa-*; these latter are possibly connected, as suggested by Rönnow: 151 and hinted also at Mayrhofer 1997: 31 s.v. *utūla-*, with (MhBh.)+ *kulūta-* (Rönnow: 118, 143, 164 with ref., 167ff. with ref.), for whose association with serpents vd. Rönnow: 150f. For some words with *kul-*, which may be affiliated to this group, cf. *kulaka-* m. '(spec. of?) green snake', 'cert. plant' (with a lex. synonym *viṣa-puṣpa(ka)-* 'having poisonous flowers'), lex., *kulika-* m. 'cert. thorny plant', ib., *kulaṭī-* f. 'red arsenic', ib., and lastly, *kū́lbaja-*, AV. 12.5.12,53, unclear, but the element *kūl-* thereof belonging to this group, cf. the preceding *aghá-viṣā-* at vs.

12 (sa'iṣā bhīmā brahma-gavy àghá-viṣā sākṣāt kṛtyā kūlbajam āvṛtā). For words with similar reduplicative elements, cf., besides *kalākula-* cited above (§6), also *urukāla(ka)-* m. 'Cucumis colocynthis = certain creeper with poisonous red fruits', lex.

§11 Especially interesting in this connection is the name of the female Buddhist Tantric deity Kurukullā. This has been explained unsurely (and actually without any supporting evidence) by Moṇier-Williams: 294a and following him (though remarking: ei nām'ṭir keu byākhyā den'ni) by Sen: 9(f.), as from [*]*kuru-kulyā-* 'belonging to Kuru race' (kuru deśer nadī (athabā kurubaṃ'śer upāsyā) debī, Sen). In her forthcoming book, in the chapter on Kurukullā: divine enchantress with flowered bow, Miranda Shaw has discussed her association with the Kurukulla mountain (personal communication 1997), but this does not shed any further light on the etymology of the word. But, there are numerous references at SdhnM. 171, 180f., 185 to the association of Kurukullā with serpents, her power and control over them and to rites and herbal remedies for cure from poison. Kurukullā is kāma-sarpāpahantrī ('killer/dispeller of snakes at will') and Tārkṣyāsanā (at Bhattacharyya 1928: 372); the particular phala of muttering the name of Śukla-Kurukullā is cure from poison (o.c.: 364). Rites and procedures for cure from poison are mentioned in connection with Tārodbhava-Kurukullā (o.c.: 346f.), Śukla-Kurukullā (o.c.: 370 [with references to the serpent Śeṣa and Garuḍa or vulture, and to the poisoned person's bathing in the water of the milky ocean], esp. 371 [which contains, in a Prakrit verse, the word *sāpuḍa-*, perhaps from **sa̍rpatuṇḍ(ik)a-*, cf. *a̍hituṇḍika-* 'snake-charmer; °-catcher; °-exhibitor; juggler'; cf. perhaps Bengali *sāpuṛe* 'id.']), Kurukullā (o.c.: 374-78), Sita-Kurukullā (o.c.: 387, where the vidyā of Sita-Kurukullā is said to be "sādhanaṃ viṣa-dantasya"). Though Sen: 9(f.) is not absolutely right in saying that her mount was the serpent, the close association of Kurukullā with serpents is noteworthy. Māyājālakrama-Kurukullā, a form of Kurukullā, sits on the back of the serpent Takṣaka, while Śukla-Kurukullā, another variety, has her hair tied up by the serpent Ananta, her necklace formed by Vāsuki and prominent ear-ornament by Takṣaka, her sacred thread being Karkoṭaka (§6), girdle Padma the lord of serpents, anklet the serpent Mahāpadma, bracelet Śaṅkhapāla and armlet Kulika (§6), vd. Bhattacharyya 1968: 148f., 152, 1925: 363, 385f. The eight "Kurukullā-Nāgas" have been referred to as the ornaments of Kurukullā (Bhattacharyya 1925: 377f., with references to Tārkṣya and Garuḍa). Muttering the name of and doing homas to Śukla-Kurukullā enables one to attract even the serpent maiden. Mantras have the power to attract serpents (o.c.: 286, in connection with Sita-Kurukullā). (Herbal) remedies for cure from poison have been cited in a verse in the section on Śukla-Kurukullā (o.c.: 366), which is characterised as, or followed by a sub-section styled as, viṣa-tantra, an aside in the text, not related to her practice directly. Vd. also pp. 371 (in connection with Śukla-Kurukullā), 377f. (in connection with Kurukullā, with a reference to drinking of water by the snake-bitten patient). Various types of dhyānas are cited in connection with the cure from poison in the sections on Śukla-Kurukullā (o.c.: 371) and Kurukullā (o.c.: 378), while a certain type of muttering is said to cure poison (o.c.: 386, in the section on Sita-Kurukullā). Interesting in this connection are the epithets *aṅkurā-*, *maṅkurā-*, especially *kurukurā-* of the Buddhist deity Parṇaśavarī, the healer of diseases in general (for whose secondary association with poison vd. SdhnM. 150 at Bhattacharyya 1925: 309), attested in her dhāraṇī (l.c., o.c.: 310). Cf. incidentally, at SdhnM. 120 (at Bhattacharyya 1925: 250), the peculiar expressions like koḍā, (ni)kuruḍā, (ni)puruḍā, ilavikalaviṣe, śītavattāle, hale, halale etc. (vd. §6) in a charm against snake-bite in connection with Jāṅgulī, the Buddhist snake-goddess who cures poison (in her principal two hands strumming a lute, presumably to attract by music the serpents, who, according to Indian popular belief, are fond of the same).

§12 Interesting in this connection is the second element of the Kashmirian Paippalāda reading *udakūlā-* for Śaunaka *urugū̍lā-*; for the change ŚS. *g* : PS. *k*, cf. *a̍ligī-*, *víligī-* : *ālaka̍-*, *vyālaka-*. For another example of ŚS. sonant for PS. (Kashmir) surd, cf. *upaj'ka̍-*, °*jīka̍-*, AV. : °*cīkā-*, AVP. (Kashmir), Pali °*cikā-* 'white ant' (*j* for *c*, like *g* for *k*). The Paippalāda reading is surely not folk-etymological 'of water bank'; *da* for *ru*, if not a phonetic change, may be a scribal mistake in Śāradā script, influenced by a tendency towards etymologizing. The original form could well be **uru-kūl-ā-*

(reduplication), whence on the one hand ŚS. *urugūlā-*, on the other PS. (Kashmir) *udakūlā-*.

Bibliography

(The years in **bold** stand for the editions/volumes cited in this paper.)

Agrawala, V.[asudeva] S.[harana]. **1951**. "Some foreign words in ancient Sanskrit literature". In: Indian Historical Quarterly (Calcutta) 27.1 (March 1951): 1-17

Ammer, Karl. **1948/52**. "Die *L*-Formen im Ṛgveda". In: Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes (Wien) 51: 116-37

Arora, U.P., ed. **1991**. Graeco-Indica. India's cultural contects [sic] with the Greek world (in memory of Demetrius Galanos (1760-1833)[,] a Greek Sanskritist of Benares). New Delhi

Bagchi, Prabodh Chandra. **1929**. "Some more Austric words in Indo--Aryan.II". In: Bᵒ, Pᵒ Cᵒ, Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India, by Sylvain Lévi, Jean Przyluski and Jules Bloch, tr. from French, Calcutta: xxv-xxix

Bhattacharya, Dipak, ed. **1997**. The Paippalāda-saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda. Critically edited from palmleaf manuscripts in the Oriya script discovered by Durgamohan Bhattacharyya and one Śāradā manuscript. Vol. I. Calcutta

Bhattacharyya, Benoytosh, ed. **1925**, **1928**. Sādhanamālā. 2 vols. Baroda

–. **1968**. The Indian Buddhist Iconography. Mainly based on the Sādhanamālā and cognate Tāntric [sic] texts of rituals. Reprint with minor revisions of the revised and enlarged 2nd edn., 1958. Calcutta. [First publ. 1924]

Böhtlingk, Otto [von] and Roth, Rudolf [von], bearb. **1855**, **1858**, 1861, 1864, 1868, **1872**, **1875**. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch. 7 Theile. St. Petersburg. (References are to columns)

Debrunner, Albert. **1954**. Altindische Grammatik. Bd. 2: Einleitung zur Wortlehre. Teil 2: Die Nominalsuffixe. Göttingen

Galanos, Demetrios. **Unpubl**. [Sanskrit Dictionary]. Preserved at Athens only as manuscripts, as one of the work-projects, which are left fragmentary and bound in a confusing manner; cf. editor's note at Arora: xviiff. (information: Gabriele Zeller 1996-97). Non vidi; cited from Monier-Williams

Ghosh, Abhijit. **2000**. Non-Aryan Linguistic Elements in the AtharvaVeda [a Study of Some Words of Austric Origin]. Calcutta

Griffith, Ralph T.[homas] H.[otchkin]. **1895**, 1896. The Hymns of the Atharva-veda. Translated with a popular commentary. 2 vols. Benares: London

Hoffmann, K.(arl). **1956**. "Notizen zu Wackernagel-Debrunner, Altindische Grammatik, II,2". In: Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft (München) 8: 5-24

Kuiper, F.[ranciscus] B.[ernardus] J.[acobus]. **1948**. Proto-Munda Words in Sanskrit. Amsterdam

–. **1955**. "Rigvedic loanwords". In: Studia Indologica, Festschrift für Willibald Kirfel .., herausg. Otto Spies, Bonn: 137-85

–. **1959**. "[Review of:] .. Mayrhofer .. Lieferung 2-13 (Bd. I, 49-570, Bd. II, 1-320) .. 1954-1958". In: Museum (Leiden) 64.4 (December 1959): 209-13

–. **1991**. Aryans in the Rigveda. Amsterdam; Atlanta, G[eorgi]a

Lanman: vd. sub Whitney

Lüders, Heinrich. **1916**. "Ali und āla". In: Aufsätze zur Kultur- und Sprachgeschichte vornehmlich des Orients, Ernst Kuhn .. gewidmet ... München : Breslau: 313-25

Mayrhofer = next

Mayrhofer, Manfred. **1956**, 1963, **1976**, 1980. Kurzgefaßtes Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen. A concise etymological Sanskrit dictionary. 3 Bde. Bd. 4: Register, in collaboration with Heinz Dieter Pohl, Rüdiger Schmitt, Ronald Zwanziger. Heidelberg

–. **1992**, 1996, **1997**-2001. Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen. Heidelberg. Erster Teil: Ältere Sprache. Bde. 1 (Lief. 1-10), 2 (Lief. 11-20). Zweiter Teil: Jüngere Sprache. Bd. 3 (Lief. 21-31)

Monier-Williams, Monier. **1899**. A Sanskṛit-English Dictionary. Etymologically and philologically arranged with special reference to cognate Indo-European languages. New edn., greatly enlarged and improved with the collaboration of E.[rnst] Leumann, C.[arl Johann Wilhelm] Cappeller and other scholars. Oxford. [First publ. 1872]

Régamey, Constantin. **1934**. "Bibliographie analytique des travaux relatifs aux éléments anaryens dans la civilisation et les langues de l'Inde". In: Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient (Hanoi; Saigon; Paris) 34.(2) (publ. 1935): 429--566

Richter, Oswald. **1898**. "Die unechten Nominalkomposita des Altindischen und Altiranischen". Zweiter Teil. In: Indogermanische Forschungen (Strassburg; Berlin : New York) 9: 183-252

Rönnow, Kasten. **1936**. "Kirāta. A study on some ancient Indian tribes". In: [Le] Monde Oriental (Uppsala : Leipzig; Paris : London) 30: 90-170

Scheftelowitz, J. **1925**. "Ein urindisches Liquidengesetz". In: [Kuhns] Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung (Berlin; Gütersloh; Göttingen) 53: 248-69

Sen, Sukumār. **1981**. Bhārat-kathār Granthimocan. Kalikātā. [Vd. also 1979, ".. granthimocan", in: Ānandabājār Patrikā (Kal'kātā) annual number 1385 B.S.: 10-22]

Shaw, Miranda [Eberle]. **Forthcoming**. Her Waves of Bliss: Buddhist God-

desses of India, Tibet, and Nepal. [To be published by the Princeton University Press]

Skeat, Walter William and Blagden, Charles Otto. **1906**. Pagan Races of the Malay Peninsula. 2 vols. London. (Vd. esp. [Blagden's] "Comparative vocabulary of aboriginal dialects" in 2.[481-506], 507-768)

Tilak, Bal Gangadhar. **1917**. "Chaldean and Indian Vedas". In: [R.G. Bhandarkar Commemoration Vol.:] Commemorative Essays presented to Sir Ramkrishna Gopal B". Poona: 29-42

Whitney, William Dwight. **1905**. Atharva-veda-saṃhitā. Tr. into English with a critical and exegetical commentary. [Revised and brought nearer to completion and ed. by Charles Rockwell Lanman]. Vols. 1 (pp. i-clxii, 1-470), 2 (471--1046). Cambridge, Massachusetts

Colophon

An earlier draft of the paper was read in the International Seminar on "AtharvaVedic Studies", Department of Sanskrit, Jadavpur University, Calcutta, on 16.02.2001.

Ancillary Literature

Some Socio-Magical Aspects of the AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa

T.N. Adhikari

Abstract

The present paper seeks to draw attention of scholars to some selective aspects of the AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa, an important ancillary text of the AtharvaVeda with huge variety, which has been neglected in the field of Vedic studies.

Abbreviations

AV. = AtharvaVeda; AVP. = AtharvaVeda (Paippalāda); AVPariś. = AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa; AVŚ. = AtharvaVeda (Śaunakīya); KśkS. = KauśikaSūtra; VS. = VājasaneyiSaṃhitā

0.1 Even a brief outline of the Atharvanic literature will focus on its richness and variety. Of the four Vedic Saṃhitās, the AtharvaVeda is in bulk second only to the ṚgVeda. Out of its nine recensions, only two, Śaunaka and Paippalāda are available now, of which the former is well preserved and commented upon by Sāyaṇa (?), the celebrated commentator of the Vedas. The work is divided into 20 kāṇḍas (chapters) and consists of 731 hymns and nearly six thousand verses, reflecting the heterogeneous contents of that period.[1] This has one Brāhmaṇa text, no Āraṇyaka text, but a lot of Upaniṣads and a good number of ancillary works including KalpaSūtra, Lakṣaṇa Granthas, Pariśiṣṭas etc., the table of which can be gleaned from Modak: 3. To understand the supra-terrestrial and terrestrial significances of this ancient wisdom, these ancillary texts are inevitable, and this is an attempt to find out the relation between the AtharvaVedaSaṃhitā and one of its ancillary texts as the source of occult knowledge of the ancients, stored in the former. While discussing the focal theme, these related areas will also be touched upon.

0.2 Pariśiṣṭa means an addendum and a supplement. Thus the Pariśiṣṭa works supplement the Kalpa and Sūtra texts by supplying additional materials which are either wanting or not clear from those works. Each Veda is supplemented by such books, one or more, and Modak: 189-91 has given a list of them. Strikingly, the AtharvaVeda-

Pariśiṣṭa is most voluminous, with enormous materials like lore of constellation, royal ceremony, rituals, magic, philology, omens and portents. It consists of 72 chapters, and was first published in three parts in 1909-10 by Bolling and Negelein, who also planned for a translation which due to some unknown reason did not see the light of the day (see Bibliography). After a big gap of 83 years, B.R. Modak of Karnataka prepared a careful and laborious study in 1993 (see Bibliography). Barring a few occasional papers and findings, no translation, no reconstruction of the text, and no textual interpretation is so far done, which is a long desideratum, as observed by Modak: 14 who remarks: "It will provide an important link in the history of development of Indian thought by documenting the beliefs and practices belonging to a distinct way of life and thought". In this small paper, it is too ambitious to bring out all the tenets of this big bang; so, we have selected a small area just to emphasize its enormity. Out of the 7 or 8-odd heads, we have taken up the magical contents and touched the chapters on omens and portents. Adherence of these contents with AV. texts and Sūtra texts, and the sociology lying there, are also to be envisaged in course of discussion.

1.0 These magical contents are discussed mainly in two pariśiṣṭas (chapters 35-36), with some scattered discussions in other chapters; omens and portents are veritable and they are gathered into 23 chapters (pariśiṣṭas 50-72). A close study will reflect that the AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa showed greater adherence to the AtharvaVeda by repeating the expression pravakṣyāmi śeṣam ātharvaṇaṃ vidhim in many chapters. A few points of similarity and supplement are noted here (for details see Modak: 196-200):

i. Royal rites, KśkS. 17 = AVPariś. 2, 3
ii. Rituals of VaitānaSūtra = AVPariś. 20-33
iii. Magic, KśkS. ch. 6 (47-49) = AVPariś. 35, 36
iv. Omens and portents, KśkS. ch. 13 (93-136) = AVPariś. 50-72

[Supplementation to topics on lore of constellation = AVPariś. 1
Supplementation to topics on philology = AVPariś. 47, 48]

1.1 In early days, all over the world, society passes through three distinct stages: religion, magic and science. The chronology may not be at par in each and every society, and so often religious

rites are infected with magic in inseparable identity. Even today, when science and technology have been taken as the guiding force, magic or the dependence on occult power has not been abolished. For the practice of magical rites, Marett: 245-51 observes that most people in world perform magical acts, by which they intend to bring about certain events or conditions of these acts, the consequences of which are mystical, not scientifically validated. In the Vedic society, religion fused with magical charms and rites was practised, which were believed to be conducive to bring desired effects. While penetrating the philosophy of Vedic chaplain rites, Keith discussed at length the nature of magic in the Vedic literature (see the chapter on Vedic magic at 2.379-402). It will be noticed later on that various materials, believed to be potent with magic, associated with verses, are used to bring the situation under performer's control.

1.2 Traces of magical spells and charms are noticed in the ṚgVeda, where seers Bharadvāja and Gautama of the Āṅgirasa clan are the chief propagators of magic[2]. In the case of the AtharvaVeda, it is believed – though some scholars including myself have a different view on it – that magical charms are huge in number there (at least, first seven kāṇḍas abound with such charms) and the KauśikaSūtra shows the procedure of practising magic, which is both white and black in nature.

2.1 Of the two chapters of the AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa (viz. 35, 36), chapter 35 is designated as "āsurīkalpa" and the next one as "ucchuṣmakalpa". An introspection will reveal that they, in general, elaborate the thought-currents lying in KśkS. 47-49. The term "āsurī" is the other name of "abhicāra", i.e. black magic. Though the real meaning is not very clear, an idea is given by Dārila, the commentator of the KauśikaSūtra, in this respect.[3] The objects of abhicāra, as AVPariś. 35.1, 6, 8, 109 recounts, are many, such as killing an enemy, control over rival kings, subjugation of women, destruction of rival's family, etc. The text records that it requires no special tithi, nakṣatra, or constellation to apply the verses to attain desired results. Sāyaṇa (?) iterates in the same vein, in the introduction to his commentary on the AtharvaVeda (vs. 10).[4] Both the chapters record numerous items which are required for practising magical rites, such as mustard seeds, anointed firesticks, cūrṇa (lead?), plants

like arka, palāśa, sureśvarī, ṭagara, kuṣṭha, māṃsī, khadira, udumbara, bilva, cane, dūrvā grass etc., other materials like clarified butter, curd, bitter oil, milk, honey, blood, poison, salt, hair of a dog, coriander seeds (tumbara), onion, garlic, mire (utkaraṇa) from a lotus pond and so on, and some other strange things like flesh of a dead animal, ashes from cemetery, ichor of an elephant, according to different castes or genders (AVPariś. 35.18, 19). These materials, associated with typical spells, bring control over women, beget kingdom, remove disease and misfortune, and even bring control over god[5]. No unusual happening (adbhutāni) or disturbance (upadrava), it has been reiterated there, can do any harm to him or to his riches or children, who practises these magical rites (AVPariś. 35.2.11).

2.2 Ucchuṣma is the other name of the fierce nature of the brown-complexioned (mahāpiṅgala) Śiva-Rudra. His maleficent appearance is depicted in a few verses. These verses are highly efficient in giving boons to the practitioners[6]. Numerous verses are also found in the ucchuṣmakalpa on the materials and procedure required in black magic. Several verses are coined here, some of which are meaningless sounds[7]. The language reflects a very late age, and is even non-Sanskritic. Magical performances are prescribed to cure diseases, sickness and fever of all kinds, bring peace at home, secure safety for the king, etc. (AVPariś. 36.19.1). These may be regarded as white magic and mere elaboration of the Kauśika formulae.

2.3 Some fragmentary references to magical activities are found in other chapters of the AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa. Chapter 31, known as "koṭihoma", refers to abhicāra in the ghṛtakambala ceremony, and there is a reference that by practising abhicāra, one can kill his enemy by murmuring sāvitrī verses (31.8.4, 5; 31.9.4, 5). Cāṇḍāla-fire, fire ashes of a crematory and fire used at a birth-place (sūtikāgṛha) are useful for witchcraft (31.9.2). The sociology behind these clearly reflects the non-śrauta community's inception in the AtharvaVeda-arena. Chapter 25 of the AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa, "kuṇḍalakṣaṇa" by name, refers to various types of fire-altar that are required in magical rites[8]. Some other scattered references to magical rites may be found in the work, if sorted out minutely.

2.4 Chapters 50-72 of the AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa are known as omens and portents. Following KśkS. ch. 13 (93-136), detailed apprehension of peculiar events (adbhutāni) like star-wars (67), environment (61) etc. and a lot of discourse on omens and portents made by concerned experts like Garga, Kroṣṭuki, Bhārgava, Bṛhaspati etc. are recorded there. The experts in these areas, mostly on the basis of the physical observation of certain indications from the unnatural behaviour of birds, small animals and insects, environment, colour of the cloud, all directions, unnatural odour of earth, movements of stars and planets, the sun and moon, etc., foretell the undesirable events that may follow them. A serious scrutiny of these foretellings reveals that while scientific advancement did not crop up to a hightening stage, the people tried to smite of the thick fog of ignorance and fear about future by the tool of observation and experience. After all, to know the unknown future to live in peace with sound health and mind for a hundred autumns was a common cherished desire of Vedic folks[9]. A serious study of these chapters, following the KauśikaSūtra, is required to understand the ancient wisdom of India in the areas of astronomy and astrology, which had a great impact on later treatises on astronomy and astrology like BṛhatSaṃhitā, GargaSaṃhitā etc. Before concluding our deliberation, we look back to the adherence of these socio-magical aspects to the texts of the AtharvaVeda and KauśikaSūtra, and, at the same time, express our own views on this subject.

2.5 Scholars admit, the AtharvaVeda itself exhibits a double-faced character. The two chief redactors of this Veda, viz. Atharvan and Aṅgiras, are the protagonists of these two opposite characters. The text itself may not reflect the total truth; yet, its two forms are recognized first in the GoPathaBrāhmaṇa. At least on two occasions this Brāhmaṇa records that its one form is auspicious (śānta), while the other one is fierce (ghora)[10]. Sāyaṇa, too, records both the "śāntipauṣṭikakarman" and "abhicārakarman" of the AtharvaVeda in his introduction to AVŚ. commentary[11]. Modern scholars like Bloomfield: 3, Macdonell: 185-86, etc. proclaim that the chief aim of the AtharvaVeda is "to appease, to bliss, to curse". Though some scholars including myself nowadays do not subscribe this view as a whole, yet it is true that the redactors of the AtharvaVeda had a

definite plan in arranging the AV. verses. The first part comprises first seven kāṇḍas consisting of small hymns, where the so-called charms and spells on medicine, long life, witchcraft, royal rites etc. are incorporated. A careful study will reflect that the magical elements, which were mainly despised in the ṚgVeda, have been accepted as a part of life in the Atharvanic society.

3.1 Coming to the KauśikaSūtra, it appears, the Sūtra text elaborates the magical practices and the Atharvanic charms associated with it (ch. 6, kaṇḍikās 47-49). The term used there is "abhicāra" and it is interpreted as killing the enemy for self-protection by Dārila (on KśkS. 47.1), and Keśava takes it as "āṅgirasakalpa". Actually, the AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa complements, supplements and at the same time elaborates the theories propagated by the Kauśika. Without detailing the matters, we here put a few points of similarity and dissimilarity:

a. Both agree that the AtharvaVeda is the source of abhicāra rites and also of white magic, and Atharvan priests are the genuine people to practice it.

b. The purposes of abhicāra are killing the enemy, control over women, rival king and evil forces, removing diseases, gaining peace at home, etc.

c. Both speak about iconic magic, symbolic magic, instrumental magic, and magic performed by charms and materials.

d. Materials with magic potency like various plants and trees, amulets, fire, water, metals, butter, curd, honey etc. are recorded.

3.2 Dissimilar points are not very much noteworthy. Kauśika prefers lead for performing magic, while the AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa depends on mustard seeds. AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa buttresses on melted ghee, while water-lightning (udavajra) is a very powerful instrument in the Kauśika[12]. Kauśika usually employs AV. verses as magical spells either in full or by means of pratīka, while the AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa invents new, new verses of its own, supposed to be potent with magical power. Kauśika speaks of iṅgiḍa oil for witchcraft, whereas the AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa prescribes bitter oil (kaṭu-

-taila), etc. Barring these minor differences, AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa shows substantial adherence to the KauśikaSūtra.

4.1 If from the foregoing deliberation, anyone receives an impression that the AV. text is nothing but a collection of unholy charms and a store-house of sorcery, omens, portents and magical activities, he should not be blamed. An impact created by the KauśikaSūtra and its commentators like Dārila and Keśava, by DharmaŚāstrakāras like Manu and even by the noted commentator Sāyaṇa (?), was substantiated by modern AtharvaVeda-specialists like Bloomfield: 3, Whitney, passim, Shende: 153-77, Bhaṭṭācārya: 84-111, etc., who tried to highlight this character which is incongruous with this Veda (cf. also Macdonell: 155-70).[13]

4.2 It is not the right place to discuss at length the flaws lying with the above interpretations. But it should be noted here that their observation is half truth, one side of the coin and not holistic. Scholars in recent days are coming forward with proofs that the AtharvaVeda is essentially a book of social poetry, where the weal and woe, laugh and tear, prosperity and adversity, and the wells and evils of the common people are blended together, thus giving it a shape of the true representative of the cultural plurality of Indian society. Without elaborating this view, some chips may be documented here. First, in the whole range of the Śaunaka text the word "abhicāra" has been used only four times, out of more than fifty thousand-odd vocabulary: AVŚ. 8.2.26 (= AVP. 16.5.6), 10.3.7 (= AVP. 16.63.7), 11.1.22 (= AVP. 16.90.9, but no reference to "abhicāra"), 19.9.9 (not found in Paippalāda). Its true meaning being uncertain, Sāyaṇa (?) preferred to follow the Kauśika, or rather Dārila, who took it to be a word with a negative connotation like killing the enemy. But the sense of 'black magic' more or less gained no good ground in the AV. text itself. It is rather a creative fantasy of the Kauśika, and then its followers. Thus, Bali: 51-53 remarks in this context that abhicārakarman underwent a conceptual change and began to signify heinous deeds in the later Sūtra period and in the age of the Purāṇas and DharmaŚāstras, and concludes that it is therefore academically indiscreet to lebel the AtharvaVeda as magical chants. He comes heavily on both the Indian and Western propagators of magic elements in the AtharvaVeda. Secondly,

GoPathaBrāhmaṇa, the only Brāhmaṇa text of the AtharvaVeda, makes no discussion on magic or abhicāra, excepting a few references to it. This silence is very significant. Scholars like Singh, Śāstrī and Ācārya have tried to show that out of 233 medicinal herbs of the AtharvaVeda, the known herbs exhibit medicinal power and the amulets are not at all stones, but medicinal herbs. Singh ratifies that the terms "rākṣasa", "asura", "amīvā" etc. are actually figurative expressions for bacteria or virus etc., and do not stand for unholy forces. I have also tried to establish the same in a paper on medicine (Adhikari 2001). Gonda: 277-87, after a careful examination of the contents of the AtharvaVeda, contradicted his occidental counterparts by commenting that its subject-matter cannot be designated wholly as "witchcraft". I have expressed a similar opinion in another paper (Adhikari, forthcoming). It is our considered opinion that the AtharvaVeda definitely possesses some magical elements, but this is not its chief character, as it is claimed.

5.1 Now comes the most partinent question. Why then does the KauśikaSūtra elaborate abhicāra rites, omens and portents, and why do commentators and scholars speak highly on the magic of the AtharvaVeda?

The answer may not be as difficult as it appears. Commentators and modern scholars, while interpreting the AtharvaVeda follow chiefly the KauśikaSūtra and other similar texts, without verifying the character of the AV. verses. Even Sāyaṇa (?), we are coerced to say, did not pay the deserved attention to AtharvaVeda, in comparison with the other Vedas. And it is no denying fact that the time gap between the AtharvaVeda and the KauśikaSūtra is no less than several hundred years. It is difficult to keep the tradition unchanged in a human society for hundreds of years. The social conditions, restrictions and practices of those days were reflected in the interpretation of the AtharvaVeda, and later on it was substantiated by other commentators, and this has only multiplied the contradiction in the AtharvaVeda. Certainly, it is a Himalayan task to find out at present the true social position of the AtharvaVeda. But one thing is now clear: it is the primary task of modern scholars to find out the meaning of the AtharvaVeda, without besmearing it with its applica-

tion. Applications are secondary in nature, and many a time they distort the significances of the hymns. The KauśikaSūtra or AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa, to get their own Vedic foothold, used the AtharvaVedic brand name. Thus, the sociology of different ages has been intermingled, which needs to be studied thoroughly to understand the distinctive social surroundings of those ages. The Atharvanic people had a twofold aim, and the AtharvaVeda has been characterized as "the most mobile form of Vedic ideology" by Anirbāṇ: 79.

6.1 It is no easy task to decide, to which of the two existing schools of the AtharvaVeda, viz. the Śaunaka and the Paippalāda (leaving aside the other seven recensions known more or less only in names), the AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa belonged. Neither did Bolling and Negelein, who pioneered the AVPariś. edition, touch the question, nor did Modak, whose work on the AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa is well known, make any remarkable comments on it. This voluminous ancillary Ātharvaṇa text with 72 chapters is probably a composition of a very late date, even post-Pāṇinian, and in my opinion its first 48 chapters were composed earlier than the rest. Chapter 49, named "caraṇavyūha", is noteworthy, because it gives a list of the names of all the 72 chapters. Anyway, at least so far as internal evidences are concerned, it may be asserted that the composer(s) of the work knew very well both the AtharvaVedic recensions, but at the same time it appears that this text exhibits a closer adherence to the Paippalāda school. To illustrate, pariśiṣṭa 19 ("brahmayāgavidhi") is to be uttered by a Śaunaka-priest (19.1.1), while pariśiṣṭa 23 ("yajñapātralakṣaṇa") refers to the Śaunaka-priests as Veda-chanters (23.13.4); pariśiṣṭa 25 ("kuṇḍalakṣaṇa") is to be narrated by Śaunaka (25.1.1), and he is also the narrator of the ritual described at pariśiṣṭa 30, "laghulakṣahoma" (30.1.1). Pariśiṣṭa 43 ("śrāddhakalpa") speaks of Śaunaka (43.4.53), while pariśiṣṭa 46 ("uttamapaṭala") records the initial verses of both the Śaunaka and Paippalāda recensions (46.5.1). However, references to the Paippalāda abound in the early chapters of the text. To demonstrate, the initial pariśiṣṭa ("nakṣatrakalpa") says in the colophon: kṛttikārohiṇīmadhye paippalādamantrāḥ, while pariśiṣṭa 8 ("ghṛtakambala") prescribes in the colophon that AVP. verses are to be chanted at the time of watching clarified butter. Pariśiṣṭa 39 ("taḍāgavidhi") refers to the Paippalāda priest (39.1.1).

But the most important references to the Paippalādins are found in pariśiṣṭa 2 ("rāṣṭrasaṃvarga"), where for a better administration of the kingdom, the Paippalāda priest is preferred even to the Śaunakīya, while other priests are simply ignored (2.3.5, 6.1); this establishes that though AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa shows acquaintances with both the AtharvaVedic recensions, it has a leaning towards the Paippalāda school. (Cf. incidentally Witzel: 265f.)

Concluding remarks

AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa is an end product of the Atharvan tradition, which has been handed down in different ages, and a gulf difference of time between AtharvaVeda and the AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa exists. Magic, religion and science existed in all ages, as even today, round the globe, and cultural vicissitude is a social reality, which does not necessarily advance with the advancement of time and space in an arithmetic calculation. Vedic society should be interpreted with a careful handling of later-aged texts; otherwise, overlapping is bound to contradict its interpretation. Human psychology is a complex one, which always cherishes to enjoy peace and wishes to unveil man's uncertain future gagged with superstitions; occult beliefs and faith in the power of supernatural elements always exist. Fear chases man's life; omens and portents do not leave him. The philosophy and religion, even spirituality, of the AtharvaVeda should be understood under all these conditions. The sociology behind the composition of the AV. hymns with these supra-natural and terrestrial aspects can be better understood with such a holistic attitude.

Notes

[1] Sāyaṇa shows the multifaced tenets of the text in his introduction to the AtharvaVeda which was classified into 14 heads by Bloomfield: 57.

[2] There are numerous magical hymns and verses in the ṚgVeda, e.g. 1.191, 2.42, 43, 3.53.12, 7.104.21-24, 10.162, 163, etc. A few more references can be found if searched out minutely. Other Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas also refer to magic.

[3] Dārila Bhaṭṭa defines abhicāra as "paravināśapratiṣedha" at KśkS. 47.1.

[4] na tithir na nakṣatraṃ na graho na ca candramāḥ/ atharvamantrasamprāptyā sarvasiddhir bhaviṣyati// (quoted from AVPariś. 2.4.5). Cf. also Sāyaṇa: vyākhyāya vedatritayam āmuṣmikaphalapradam/ aihikāmuṣmikaphalaṃ caturthaṃ vyācikīrṣati//.

[5] īśvaro 'pi vaśo bhavet. AVPariś. 35.2.9.

[6] grāme vā 'thāpy araṇye vā pracareta yathāvidhiḥ/ sadyaḥ siddhikarā hy ete ucchuṣmāḥ parikīrtitāḥ//. AVPariś. 36.2.2.

[7] The meaningless verses are like hā hā hī hī namaḥ svāhā, khanakhanāya namaḥ svāhā, ghusughusāya namaḥ svāhā etc. at AVPariś. 36.9.

[8] sarvaśāntikaraṃ kuṇḍam padmākāraṃ viśeṣataḥ/
śāntike caturāśaṃ ca pauṣṭike vartulaṃ tathā//

abhicāre trikoṇaṃ ca vaśyādau cārdhacandrakam/
ṣaṭkoṇaṃ māraṇādau ca vidveṣe cāṣṭakoṇakam// (25.1.10, 11).

[9] Cf. paśyema śaradaḥ śatam, jīvema śaradaḥ śatam etc., AVŚ. 19.67.1-8 (not found in the Paippalāda), VS. 36.24.

[10] taṃ pañcasv apaśyad ṛci yajuṣi sāmni śānte 'tha ghore, 1.2.21, 5.10.

[11] Sāyaṇa here classified the contents of the AtharvaVeda along that line.

[12] udavajrān praharati, 47.11.

[13] A general impression on the same line is found in almost all historical writings on the AtharvaVeda.

Bibliography

Ācārya, Satyadev. 1996. "Atharvaved meṃ jāduṭonā". In: Paropakārī, Ajmer, Rajasthan: July issue

Adhikari, T.[arak] N.[ath]. 2001. "Concept of Disease and its Causes in the AtharvaVeda: Some Observations". In: Anvīkṣā[:] Research Journal of the Department of Sanskrit, Jadavpur University, Calcutta, vol. 22: 93-97

–. Forthcoming. "Interpretation of Atharva[n] Mantras: Some Fresh Questions". Read out in the Vedic section of the 10th World Sanskrit Conference, Bangalore 1997

Anirbāṇ. 1975. Bed-Mīmāṃ'sā ⌊(a Vedic Compendium)⌋. Pratham khaṇḍa. Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series no. 13, Studies no. 4

Bali, Suryakant. 1981. Historical and Critical Studies in the Atharvaveda. Delhi

Bhaṭṭācārya, Nārāyaṇ'candra. 1963. Atharbabede Bhāratīya Saṃ'skṛti. Kalikātā

Bloomfield, Maurice. 1899. The Atharva[-]Veda [and the Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa]. Strassburg. Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde (Encyclopedia of Indo-Aryan Research), Bd. 2, Heft 1, B

Bolling, George Melville and Negelein, Julius von, ed. 1909, 1910, 1910. The Pariśiṣṭas of the Atharvaveda. Vol. 1, pts. 1-3. Leipzig

Gonda, Jan. 1975. History of Indian Literature. Vol. 1, fasc. 1. Wiesbaden

Keith, Arthur Berriedale. 1925. The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads. Halves 1, 2. Cambridge, Massachusetts. Harvard Oriental Ser. (publ. by Harvard University), vols. 31, 32

Macdonell, Arthur A.[nthony]. 1900. A History of Sanskrit Literature. London

Marett, R.[obert] R.[anulph]. 1915. "Magic (Introductory)". In: Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics, Edinburgh, vol. 8: 245-51

Modak, B.R. 1993. The Ancillary Literature of the Atharvaveda. Rastriya Vedavidya Pratisthan, Delhi

Śāstrī, Dīnanāth. 1994. "Atharvaved meṃ bheṣaj'vijñān". In: Paropakārī, Ajmer, Rajasthan. November issue

Shende, N.J. 1952. The Religion and Philosophy of the Atharvaveda. Bhandarkar Oriental Series no. 8, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona

Singh, S.P. Forthcoming. "Atharvaveda as the Source of Medical Sciences"

Whitney, William Dwight. 1905. Atharva-veda-saṃhitā. Tr. into English with a critical and exegetical commentary. Vols. 1, 2. Cambridge, Massachusetts. Harvard Oriental Ser. (publ. by Harvard University), vols. 7, 8

Witzel, Michael. 1985. "Die Atharvaveda-Tradition und die Paippalāda-Saṃhitā". In: Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Supplement 6, Stuttgart: 256-71

Acknowledgment

An earlier draft of the paper was meticulously checked by Abhijit Ghosh, who made many useful suggestions which have been incorporated in this paper.

Colophon

The paper was read out at the 36th session of the International Congress of Asian and North African Studies held at the University of Montréal, Canada (27.08.2000-02.09.2000).

AtharvaVeda-PrayogaBhānu

(DharmaŚāstra of the AtharvaVedins)

S.S. Bahulkar

Abstract

The AtharvaVeda was seldom considered worthy of being included in the tradition of the Traividyas, i.e., the followers of the first three Vedas. The AtharvaVedins therefore endeavoured to establish their own ritualistic tradition through the ages. In their attempt at self-exaltation, they freely borrowed from other traditions whatever was essential and modified it so as to appear as genuinely AtharvaVedic. The first attempts in this respect could be the GoPathaBrāhmaṇa, the Pariśiṣṭas of the AtharvaVeda, as also the VaitānaŚrautaSūtra. The Bhāṣyas and the Paddhatis on the ritual Sūtras of the AtharvaVeda tried to elaborate the ritual. The Prayoga literature incorporated more and more ritual details and amplified the rites. In the present paper, some observations on a late attempt of the AtharvaVedins of establishing their DharmaŚāstra have been made. The discussion is based on the AtharvaVeda-PrayogaBhānu, a late Prayoga text in the AtharvaVeda tradition in Gujarat. Pt. Ravishankar Nagar, an AtharvaVedin, composed quite an elaborate Prayoga describing various domestic rites, where he tried to follow the established works on the DharmaŚāstra, but modified some of the contents by giving them the "AtharvaVedic" shape.

The AtharvaVeda is generally regarded to be the Veda of witchcraft, sorcery and a number of evil practices aimed at causing harm to enemies. Although it possesses a double nature (dvisvabhāva) and consists of benevolent practices, variously called as śāntika, pauṣṭika and bheṣaja and represented by the mantras Atharvanic in character, and malevolent practices, variously called as ghora, abhicāra and yātu and represented by the Āṅgirasa mantras, it had always been looked down upon by the followers of the first three Vedas, the Traividyas. As a matter of fact, no Veda is absolutely free from sorcery or black magic. We do find this element in the solemn rites of the Traividyas also. In this connection Bloomfield has rightly observed: "Yet the Veda without witchcraft would not be the Veda, and the śrauta-texts are not in the position to throw stones against the Atharvan"[1]. While witchcraft became part of the religion, the Vedic texts in general and the later works on DharmaŚāstra condemned sorcery practices, sometimes identifying them with the AtharvaVeda. Even the authors of the Jaina and the Buddhist works joined hands with the followers of Vedic religion in the condemnation of the Atharvanic practices.[2] In the tradition of the AtharvaVeda, however, this Veda has been glorified as the Veda superior to all others. In the introduction to his commentary on the AtharvaVeda-Saṃhitā of the Śaunaka recension, Sāyaṇa (?) attempts to emphasize the importance and uniqueness of that Veda, in the following words:

vyākhyāya vedatritayam āmuṣmikaphalapradam/
aihikāmuṣmikaphalaṃ caturthaṃ vyācikīrṣati// (verse 10)

'Having commented upon the (first) three Vedas, yielding the fruits to be obtained in the yonder world, the commentator (now) desires to comment upon the fourth one, yielding the fruit in this as well as the yonder world'.

Although the AtharvaVeda enjoyed some popularity in later times, it hardly ever gained due recognition in the established religion of the Traividyas.[3] The AtharvaVedins, on the other hand, continued to impose their so-called superiority and the primacy of their Veda over the other Vedas, calling their Veda as the BrahmaVeda, the Veda of Brahman, the superintendent priest in the solemn soma-sacrifices, who is supposed to be well-versed in the duties of the priests belonging to all the other Vedas and is authorised to rectify the mistakes committed by other priests (viriṣṭasandhāna). They also stressed the importance of the AtharvaVeda as the Veda revealing the knowledge of the ultimate principle, brahman, the description of which is found in the GoPathaBrāhmaṇa of the AtharvaVeda and which is further elaborated in the Upaniṣads. The Pariśiṣṭas of the AtharvaVeda are quite eloquent in admiring their Veda and criticizing the other Vedas. One of the verses in praise of the AtharvaVedin as the teacher says:

bahvṛco hanti vai rāṣṭram adhvaryur nāśayet sutān/
chandogo dhananāśāya tasmād ātharvaṇo guruḥ//
(AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa 2.4.3)

'The Bahvṛcas (i.e., the followers of the ṚgVeda) destroy the whole kingdom; the Adhvaryu (i.e., the priest belonging to the YajurVeda) would effect the destruction of king's sons; the "chanter" (of the SāmaVeda) would be responsible for the loss of wealth of the

king; therefore, the AtharvaVedin (alone should be made) the master (of the king)'.

Keśava's KauśikaPaddhati, an 11th century commentary on the KauśikaSūtra of the AtharvaVeda, quotes at the end of the work citations from a number of works, in order to show the prominence of the AtharvaVeda. All these attempts of the AtharvaVedins were aimed at, to use Bloomfield's words, "the exaltation" of their own Veda.[4] The composition of the GoPathaBrāhmaṇa and the Vaitāna-ŚrautaSūtra was an afterthought with a view to establishing the Śrauta tradition of the AtharvaVeda. There was also a Smṛti or DharmaŚāstra of Paiṭhīnasi, citations from which are found in various works on DharmaŚāstra. The works in the AtharvaVeda tradition, such as Dārila's Bhāṣya and Keśava's Paddhati on the KauśikaSūtra, quote Paiṭhīnasi, a teacher of DharmaŚāstra.[5] Unfortunately, the work of this teacher is not available. T.R. Chintamani has collected the citations from and references to the Smṛti or Dharma-Śāstra of Paiṭhīnasi as found in the works on DharmaŚāstra. However, most of the citation from the so-called PaiṭhīnasiSmṛti, found in the exegetical literature in the AtharvaVeda tradition do not generally correspond to those collected by Chintamani. It is not possible to say therefore whether Paiṭhīnasi of the works on Dharma-Śāstra was the same as the one of the AtharvaVedins. It is unlikely that the DharmaŚāstra works, predominantly composed by the Traividyas, would quote from an AtharvaVedic Smṛti or DharmaŚāstra. It is more probable that some AtharvaVedic teacher of the same name might have composed a Smṛti or DharmaŚāstra for the use of the AtharvaVedins with a view to establishing the DharmaŚāstra tradition of the AtharvaVeda. It is also possible that this work, composed by some AtharvaVedin, was ascribed to the well-known teacher Paiṭhīnasi. Whatever be the case, the work of Paiṭhīnasi may be said to be an attempt towards the establishment of the Dharma-Śāstra tradition of the AtharvaVeda.

In this connection, it is worthwhile to bring to the notice of scholars a significant attempt at establishing a ritualistic tradition of the AtharvaVeda in Gujarat towards the end of the 18th century A.D., at the time when the tradition of the AtharvaVeda had rapidly begun to disappear. This was the composition of the AtharvaVeda-

-PrayogaBhānu, popularly called by the AtharvaVedic priests in Gujarat as PrayogaBhānu[6], the only elaborate and comprehensive Prayoga-text in the tradition of the AtharvaVeda existing in Gujarat, composed by Raviśaṅkara Dviveda, an AtharvaVedin scholar belonging to the Nāgara community of Gujarat. This is quite an unusually voluminous Prayoga-text consisting of four parts called prakāśa, comprising as many as 225 sections called raśmi, describing various gṛhya rites common to all Vedic traditions as well as some characteristically AtharvaVedic rites. There is only one manuscript of this text now deposited in B.L. Institute in Ahmedabad. There is another manuscript of the fourth prakāśa, written in Śaka 1857, i.e. 1935 A.D., in Dvārikā, but now deposited in the same Institute. This is just a copy of the same old, unique manuscript, made on ruled papers by some Kṛṣṇalāla. We can say therefore that there exists virtually only one manuscript of this work.

This manuscript runs over more than 950 folios in all. Unfortunately, the third prakāśa, consisting of 97 raśmis, and about 732 folios, is totally missing. This can exactly be pointed out on the basis of a separate list (sūcīpatra) of the contents of this work, mentioning the folio numbers and the title of each of the raśmis. This list thus proves to be a useful document for ascertaining the scope of the entire work and the exact portion missing in the manuscript. This porton, i.e., the third prakāśa, deals with vivāha, gṛhapraveśa, vāstusaṃskāra, various adbhutaśāntis and rājyābhiṣeka. The remaining prakāśas have the following rites:

The first prakāśa describes the preliminary rites, such as gaṇa-patipūjana, ābhyudayika śrāddha, mātṛkāpūjana, nāndīśrāddha, puṇyāhavācana, saṃskāras beginning with garbhādhāna, jātakarman and various śāntis for the newly born child. The second raśmi begins with the saṃskāras such as nāmakaraṇa and then describes paryaṅk-ārohaṇa, dugdhapāna, karṇavedha, sūryālokana, upaveśana, anna-prāśana etc., godāna, upanayana, vedavrata and other vratas, snānavidhi, sandhyā, upākarman and other rites. The last prakāśa deals mainly with the funeral and other rites connected with death, cremation and post-cremation rites. The work thus deals with all possible ritualistic performances the AtharvaVeda Brāhmaṇas are supposed to perform as their duty. The work may be regarded to be

a characteristically unique Brahmakarmasamuccaya of the Atharva-Vedins of Gujarat.

Not much is known about the author. From the colophons, we come to know that he is Raviśaṅkara Dviveda, son of Dhīrajarāma, belonging to the sub-community Ṣaṭpannāgara, i.e. Sāṭhodarā, of the Nāgara Brāhmaṇas in Gujarat. The exact date of the author or the composition of the work cannot be ascertained at this stage. The upper limit can be decided on the basis of the works or the citations from the works the author quotes. He freely borrows from the well--known works on DharmaŚāstra, one of which is the DharmaSindhu or the DharmaSindhuSāra composed by Pt. Kāśīnāthaśāstrī Upādhyāya alias Bābā Pādhye in 1790-91 A.D. The PrayogaBhānu had been undertaken for publication by the Vedagīrvāṇapāṭhaśālā in Ahmedabad. The first, the second and the fourth prakāśas were already printed. There are available the first 16 pages of the third prakāśa in a printed form.[7] This fact indicates that the printing of the third prakāśa had also begun. It is not certain whether the printing of that prakāśa was ever completed. The printed portion covers the first raśmi and the beginning of the second. The year of publication of this edition is 1927 A.D. This could be the lower limit of the composition of the work.

The single manuscript is written in the Devanāgarī script and the handwriting is quite intelligible. However, it is full of scribal errors and corruptions. The language is easy to understand, but many a time defective from the grammatical point of view. It evinces the typical style of Sanskrit written by priests who had a little, working knowledge of that language and who did not bother much about the syntax and grammatical correctness of the usage. Sometimes it is difficult to know whether the mistake should be treated as the style of the author or as a scribal error. For instance, the text invariably has the word *abhyāttāna*, instead of *abhyātāna*, one of the offerings in the basic ritual of the pākayajña of the AtharvaVedins. The text always shows an interchange between *ṛ* and *ra*. Thus, there occurs a number of corrupt forms, such as *pratanā* for *pṛtanā, vraṇe* for *vṛṇe*, *graha* for *gṛha* and *gṛhaṇam* for *grahaṇam*. The text does not necessarily make euphonic combinations, e.g., *pūrvenhi* (sic for *pūrve'hni*) *alpeṣu*. The avagraha sign is rarely used. The use of

anusvāra is frequent, even when the parasavarṇa is essential. The text also has a frequent tendency of a double sandhi, e.g., *prāṅmukh-opaviśya* for *prāṅmukha upaviśya*, *vratādeśottamapaṭale* for *vrat-ādeśa uttamapaṭale* (prakāśa 2, p. 33). The author puts *iti* after the pratīka of a mantra. While doing so, he cites the initial letters of the mantra, and combines the word *iti*, without paying any heed to the grammatical correctness. For example, instead of saying *yasmāt kośād iti*, he says– *yasmāt kośeti*. One of the oft-quoted mantra is– brahma jajñānam (AtharvaVeda Śaunaka 4.1). The author treats these two initial words as the designation of the hymn and uses the declined form, such as *brahmajajñānena*.

Another peculiarity of the text is the way the author quotes the mantras of the AtharvaVeda. Since the work belongs to the Śaunaka recension of the AtharvaVeda, it is expected that the mantras belonging to that recension would be cited by their pratīkas. This is a convention in general followed by the authors of the KalpaSūtras. The mantras from other traditions (śākhāntarīya) are reproduced in full (sakalapāṭha) and are called "kalpaja". The Prayoga-texts do not necessarily follow this convention. Often they reproduce the śākhā-mantras also in full for the benefit of the priests who may not be able to memorize the whole mantra-portion rubricated in a particular rite. This text was composed as a priestly manual in a period of the decadence of the AtharvaVeda tradition. It therefore facilitates the reader by citing all the mantras again and again, even when they are frequently employed in the same rite. One can observe this especially in the description of godāna, caula and upanayana dealt with in the second prakāśa, where there is a number of rites common to all of them, in which the same hymns have been employed. The text has thus been quite amplified as a result of all these repetitions.

Though this Prayoga is based on the Śaunaka recension of the AtharvaVeda, it can – like the KauśikaSūtra, or the AtharvaVeda-Pariśiṣṭa (for which see T.N. Adhikari's paper published in this Volume) – also be applicable to the followers of the Paippalāda tradition in Gujarat, in the absence of their own Prayoga text. See incidentally Michael Witzel, ZDMG. Supplement 6, Stuttgart 1985, "Die Atharvaveda-Tradition und die Paippalāda-Saṃhitā", p. 265.

The author Raviśaṅkara Dviveda belongs to the Ṣaṭpannāgara or Sāṭhodarā Nāgara Brahmin community. The Nāgara Brahmins have Hāṭakeśvara or Śiva as their family deity. The temple of Hāṭakeśvara is situated at Vaḍ'nagar (or Ānandapura in ancient times), which is 60 kms. away from Ahmedabad. Besides Hāṭakeśvara, the author pays his homage to Kālī. At the outset he says:

praṇamya śrīkālīṃ hariharagaṇeśena sahitāṃ
guruṃ dattātreyaṃ nīlagirigatāṃ śrībhagamayīm/
atharvārthān dṛṣṭvā budhajanamanohlādajanakaṃ
prakurve 'haṃ granthaṃ sugamam iha saṃskārasahitam//

He frequently pays homage to Gaṇeśa, Ambikā and other deities even at the beginning of some of the prakāśas.

The author is quite familiar with other traditions and works on DharmaŚāstra. He refers to and quotes from KātyāyanaSmṛti, GobhilaPariśiṣṭa, ĀśvalāyanaPariśiṣṭa, PrayogaPārijāta, ŚāntiMayūkha, DānaMayūkha, SmṛtiKaustubha, CaturVargaCintāMaṇi, Nirṇaya-Sindhu, DharmaSindhu and so on. It appears however that he has sometimes repoduced considerable portions from the works like DānaMayūkha, NirṇayaSindhu and DharmaSindhu where a number of authorities has been quoted. Thus the quotations occurring in the PrayogaBhānu may not have been necessarily taken from those original works, but might have been reproduced from the secondary sources such as NirṇayaSindhu and DharmaSindhu. At the outset, he describes the rite called nāndīmukha in which are invoked various deities such as Gaṇeśa, Sarasvatī, Sūrya, Candra, and other planets. Some of the verses in praise of these deities are also found in the BrahmaKarmaSamuccaya of the Vājasaneyins. The author frequently reproduces the passages from the DharmaSindhu with modifications wherever necessary. For example, the duties to be discharged by a pregnant woman (garbhiṇīdharmāḥ) mentioned in this text (prakāśa 1, raśmi 35) seem to have been borrowed from the DharmaSindhu. We therefore find that the author of the PrayogaBhānu prescribes the mantras from the AtharvaVeda, in addition to those from the ṚgVeda, quoted by the author of DharmaSindhu. Sometimes he describes a rite on the lines of the tradition of the other Vedas, but mentions the peculiarity of the AtharvaVedins. For example, while describing the

godāna ceremony, he says: atharvavedināṃ tu prathame varṣe godānaṃ kāryam iti paiṭhīnasiḥ (2.9) 'Paiṭhīnasi says that the godāna ceremony of the AtharvaVedins should be performed in the first year of the child'. While modifying the prayoga, originally belonging to the works on DharmaŚāstra, he substitutes the relevant Atharvanic mantras for those of the Traividyas. At times, he discusses the peculiarity of the AtharvaVeda tradition in relation to the other Vedas; while describing the ābhyudayika śrāddha (1.2) he says: brahmavedināṃ prapitāmahād ārabhya pitṛparyantaṃ yajana-kramoktaḥ (sic for yajanakrama uktaḥ) kauśikasūktakāreṇa (= "sūtra")/ prapitāmaha-pitāmaha-pitā (? pitaraḥ) sapatnīkā ity uktatvā/ atrādau vināyakaḥ pūjyaḥ ante ca kuladevatāḥ/ iti bahvṛcapariśiṣṭādau vināyakapūjanam uktam/ ... tac ca śrāddhaṃ dvidhā/ sapiṇḍakaiḥ niragnikair nāgarair agnaukaraṇaṃ na kāryam/ svastivācana[m] etad uktaṃ śaunakena ... eka eva kumbhaḥ sthāpanīyaḥ ... śaṃ vā kanikrad it[y] ṛgvedinaḥ paṭheyuḥ/ nikāme nikāme iti yajurvedinaḥ/ tvaṣṭā no daivyam iti sāmavedinaḥ/ gaṇās tvopa gāyantu ity atharvavedinaḥ//

The text is replete with a number of verses well-known in the tradition, as well as passages from various texts. The prayogas described here are not necessarily found in the KauśikaSūtra. The rites dealt with in the Sūtra are elaborated on the basis of the Pariśiṣṭas of the AtharvaVeda, Keśava's Paddhati and works belonging to other traditions. In Gujarat, the tradition of the Mādhyandina recension of the ŚuklaYajurVeda is prominent. This work seems to have been influenced by and owes a great deal to that tradition. Works like NirṇayaSindhu and DharmaSindhu have generally been considered to be the authorities on DharmaŚāstra; it is natural for the author of the PrayogaBhānu to establish the prayogas in his tradition on the basis of these works. This can be viewed as an attempt at the self-exaltation and establishment of their own tradition, i.e., the tradition of the AtharvaVedins in the decadent period. A thorough study of this text would hopefully reveal the nature of the DharmaŚāstra of the AtharvaVedins and their interaction with the Traividyas.[8]

Notes

[1] M. Bloomfield, Hymns of the Atharva-Veda, Sacred Books of the East Series no. 42, Oxford University Press, 1897, Introduction, p. xl.

[2] Op. cit., p. lvi.

[3] The distinction between the first three Vedas (Trayī) and the AtharvaVeda and ItihāsaVeda is made clear by Kauṭilya: sāmargyajurvedās trayas trayī/ atharvavedetihāsavedau ca vedāḥ// ArthaŚāstra 1.3.1-2. Kauṭilya calls the religion of the Trayī as Trayīdharma (adhikaraṇa 1, adhyāya 3 (Trayīsthāpanā), sūtra 4).

[4] Bloomfield, op. cit., p. lxii.

[5] T.R. Chintamani, "Fragments of Paiṭhīnasi Dharmasūtra", Annals of Oriental Research, vol. 4 (part 1), 1939-40, pp. 1-40.

[6] This has a reference to my discussion with (the late) Pt. Vāsudevaśāstrī Pañcolī, one of the few AtharvaVedins in Gujarat, in 1976.

[7] I am thankful to my student Shri. Vinayak Garud for discovering these first 16 pages of the third prakāśa in Gujarat and making them available to me.

[8] I have begun a critical edition of this work.

Acknowledgment

I am grateful to my friend Abhijit Ghosh who went through my paper carefully, made valuable suggestions and added some important references.

Reports

A Tour in Orissa in Search of Manuscripts of the Paippalāda Literature*

C.G. Kashikar

On behalf of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, University of Poona, I undertook a tour of Orissa in December 1968 and January 1969 with the object of collecting information on the ancillary literature of the Paippalāda AtharvaVeda and, if possible, of acquiring manuscripts of the works pertaining to that literature. The Minister for Cultural Affairs and Civil Supplies, Government of Orissa, was requested to facilitate the tour, and he kindly agreed to give all possible help. Due intimation of my tour-programme was given to the Minister of Cultural Affairs. My assistant, Shri. Pramod Ranjan Ray, who comes from Orissa, and who is a Junior Research Fellow at the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, had gone to Orissa a few days before I left for Orissa.

On the 24th December 1968, I went from Poona to Bombay. Next morning I left Bombay for Calcutta by plane; from Calcutta I took another plane and reached Bhubaneshwar (Bhubaneśbara) the same day, that is the 25th December 1968 at 11.30 a.m. Shri. Nīlamaṇi Miśra, the Curator of the Manuscript Section of the State Museum, received me at the airport. I was taken to the Museum Guest House, where I stayed until I left Bhubaneshwar. The Ākāśa-bāṇī of Cuttack (Kaṭaka) referred to my visit of Orissa in the local news bulletin.

Next day, after having first visited the various Departments of the State Museum, I saw the manuscript collection of the Museum. There are ten thousand manuscripts, mostly written on palm-leaves, in this collection. Many of these are Sanskrit manuscripts written in the Oriya script; others are Oriya manuscripts. These manuscripts have been classified. Many of these classified manuscripts have already been catalogued, and descriptive catalogues of Sanskrit manuscripts of Kāvya-Nāṭaka, Tantra, Gaṇita and Smṛti have been published. The number of Vedic manuscripts is about 150; they are not properly catalogued so far**. The Vedic manuscripts chiefly pertain to the Saṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa of the Kāṇva ŚuklaYajurVeda,

Sāyaṇa's commentary on the entire SuklaYajurVeda KāṇvaSaṃhitā, stray portions of the Paippalāda AtharvaVeda, the Ātharvaṇa Upaniṣads, and a few Prayogas pertaining to the Śrauta and Smārta rites. The manuscript of Sāyaṇa's commentary on the KāṇvaSaṃhitā is the only manuscript of a complete work available so far. As regards the text of the KāṇvaSaṃhitā, it may be noted that the text of that Saṃhitā which has come down traditionally in Orissa consists of forty-one chapters instead of forty. Hence the manuscripts also contain that number of chapters. There is no additional portion in the text; there is only a difference of enumeration in certain chapters. The Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Tirupati, has undertaken the publication of KāṇvaSaṃhitā with the commentaries of Sāyaṇācārya and Anantācārya. A Devanagari transcript of a portion of the Orissa manuscript of Sāyaṇa's commentary is supplied to the Vidyapeetha.

The collection contains three manuscripts – two in Oriya script and one in Devanagari – of the ĀṅgirasaKalpa, a work which belongs to the Paippalāda AtharvaVeda and which is not published so far. It was found that the names of certain Vedic texts were recorded in the Catalogue of Smṛti manuscripts. For example, two manuscripts of the ĀṅgirasaKalpa which is evidently a Vedic text have been registered in the Smṛti-Catalogue. As regards the Ātharvaṇa Upaniṣads, some of these have already been published. But a comprehensive study of these Upaniṣads, particularly in comparison with the Orissan manuscripts of those texts, requires to be undertaken. The unpublished texts will have to be published, those already published will have to be revised, and scientific evaluation of the Ātharvaṇa Upaniṣads as a whole needs to be attempted in the larger context of Upaniṣadic philosophy.

The Utkal University of Bhubaneshwar has also a collection of palm-leaf manuscripts. There are about three thousand manuscripts which have been listed topic-wise. The collection contains both Sanskrit and Oriya texts. No catalogue of these manuscripts is published so far. The collection contains only thirty-three manuscripts of Vedic texts.*** It is, however, noteworthy that the collection contains a manuscript of the ĀṅgirasaKalpa written in the Oriya script, and a number of Ātharvaṇa Upaniṣads. There is also a

manuscript of Sāyaṇa's commentary on a few chapters of the Sukla-YajurVeda KāṇvaSaṃhitā. A peculiarity of the manuscript of the ĀṅgirasaKalpa is that in the initial folio it records, in the modern way, the detailed contents of the text as found in the different folios.

I met Dr. Harekrushna Mahtab, a former Chief Minister of Orissa, who takes keen interest in academic matters. I also met Shri. Aniruddha Das, Secretary to the Government of Orissa, Department of Education and Cultural Affairs, who is also working as the Director of Social Welfare. The scholar who is closely connected with the AtharvaVeda tradition in Orissa is Padmaśrī Paramānanda Ācārya. It was principally with the help of this scholar that the late Professor Durgamohan Bhattacharyya of Calcutta visited Orissa about twelve years back and contacted the AtharvaVedins. Usually Shri. Ācārya lives in Bāripadā, but he had come to Bhubaneshwar for some work. I met him and explained to him the purpose of my visit to Orissa. Consequently, I fixed the programme of my tour in the districts of Orissa in consultation with him.

I first went to Baiśiṅgā in Mayurbhanj (Mayūrabhañja) district, and met Shri. Dāmodara Paṇḍā who himself is a Paippalāda AtharvaVedin, and had organised a gathering of the followers of that Vedic school for the convenience of Professor Bhattacharyya. He has also been conducting a Karmakāṇḍa Vidyālaya where students are taught the texts of the domestic rituals according to the Paippalāda AtharvaVeda. I had a detailed discussion with him on the point of procuring the manuscripts of the Paippalāda texts and also of collecting information in respect of the cultural history of the AtharvaVedins. He related to me his experience in the field of procuring manuscripts and organising the AtharvaVedins. Also, he expressed his willingness to help me as much as he could.

Next day I went to the village Mākandā in the Balasore (Bāleśbara) district, and met a Vaidika named Cakradhara Upādhyāya, whom I had already met at a Vedic Conference. He is the teacher at the Karmakāṇḍa Vidyālaya at Baiśiṅgā and has collected several Smārta Prayogas of the Paippalāda school. I requested him to collect as many Paippalāda Smārta Prayogas as possible, particularly in comparison with those of the other Vedic schools, and get them

printed in Oriya script for the benefit of the AtharvaVedins in Orissa who are badly in need of such Prayogas and properly trained priests. I also requested him to prepare a Devanagari transcript of those Prayogas so that they might be published and become available to Vedic scholars for their study of this Vedic school. He agreed to the proposals. I also met another Vaidika in that village.

Then I proceeded to Bāripadā, the district headquarters of the Mayurbhanj district. Here I met Pt. Navakiśora Śāstrī, the Principal of the Sanskrit Pāṭhaśālā, who had studied at Varanasi under Mm. Laxmansastri Dravid. I had a discussion with him about the position of traditional Vedic studies in Orissa. I also met Pt. Pūrṇacandra Miśra who belonged to ŚuklaYajurVeda and had maintained the aupāsana fire. There is in Bāripadā a big library called the Rāmacandra Library which has some archaeological, epigraphical and manuscript collections. I could not find there anything useful to me.

I met Shri. Jayakṛṣṇa Paṇḍā with whom I have been in correspondence for the last few years. He is a Paippalāda AtharvaVedin, and is the son of Mohanacandra Paṇḍā, a noted Vaidika and astrologer, whom I had personally met some years ago at a Vedic Conference, but who is no more now. I desired to go to the village Gajiṛi, about 20 miles from Bāripadā, to meet Shri. Harekṛṣṇa Paṇḍā, the younger brother of the late Mohanacandra Paṇḍā, whom also I had met some years back at a Vedic Conference along with his brother. He is said to have a few manuscripts in his possession. But I was told that he was absent from his village. There is another village named Rāṇībandha, near Gajiṛi, where there is an Atharva-Vedin who is said to have possessed Sanskrit manuscripts. Since I was advised that no purpose would be served by visiting that place which was out of the way, I abandoned the idea of going to that place.

There is, in Bāripadā, a private manuscript collection at present owned by Shri. Makaradhbaja Bhañja who is related to the princely family of Mayurbhanj. His father, Shri. Praphulla Bhañja who was a Professor of Sanskrit in Great Britain, had collected about three thousand palm-leaf manuscripts of Sanskrit texts. It was reported that nobody had been able so far to have any access to the

library for inspection. My efforts to have an access to the collection met with the same fate.

From Bāripadā I wanted to go to Nīḷagiri in Balasore district where a few AtharvaVedins are said to be living. Since, however, no definite information could become available, I had to drop the plan. I, therefore, went to Bhadrak (Bhadrakha), a Tālukā town in the same district. There are near Bhadrak, three villages named Taḷāṅga, Geluṭiā and Carampā where AtharvaVedins were said to be living. First I went to Taḷāṅga to meet Shri. Baḷabhadra Upādhyāẏa, but unfortunately he was absent from house. I had discussion on Atharvan tradition with his relatives who showed me a few palm-leaf mss., none of which pertained to the Vedic literature. I tried to meet another AtharvaVedin from that village, Shri. Kṛṣṇacandra Kara who had already given away his manuscripts to the State Museum, Bhubaneshwar. He was also not present. About Geluṭiā and Carampā, I was told that the Atharvan tradition of those villages had become extinct.

From Bhadrak I went to Jajpur (Yājapura), a Tālukā town in Cuttack district. This is a very old town and a famous pilgrimage--centre known as Virajākṣetra from the MahāBhārata period. The tradition goes that Yayāti-keśarī, a king of the Soma-vaṃśa dynasty of Orissa, performed in the 10th century 10 Aśvamedha sacrifices at this place for which he had invited a large number of Brāhmaṇas from Kānyakubja. There is a Daśāśvamedha Ghāṭ on the river Vaitaraṇī in Jajpur even at present. A pillar commemorating this event exists in Jajpur. The place was later known as Yayātipura. There are Brāhmaṇas belonging to the Ṛk, Yajus and Sāman, but no trace could be had of any AtharvaVedins. From Jajpur I returned to Bhubaneshwar.

At Bhubaneshwar I again visited the manuscript libraries at the State Museum and the Utkal University and closely studied the manuscripts of the Ātharvaṇa Upaniṣads and the ĀṅgirasaKalpa. I also inspected a few manuscripts of the ritualistic Prayogas and Nibandhas. I again met Padmaśrī Paramānanda Ācārya and gave him a report of my tour. At the University I met Prof. P. Pradhan and other teachers, and gave a talk to the post-graduate students in Sanskrit. I again met Dr. H. Mahtab and apprised him of my efforts.

I went to Konarak (Koṇārka) and Puri (Purī) by the jeep kindly provided to me by the Director of Cultural Affairs. At Puri I went to the Sadāśiva Sanskrit College where I met the teaching staff. I explained to them the purpose of my visit to Orissa.

I met the representative of the Hindustan Samachar News Agency and explained to him the purpose of my visit to Orissa. A news-item based on the same appeared in Orissa newspapers of the 13th January, 1969.

Since my tour-programme had come to a close, I left Bhubaneshwar, and returned to Poona on the 16th January, 1969.

In connection with this tour, I express my thanks to the Government of Orissa who helped me in my task in manifold ways. I am particularly grateful to Shri. Nityananda Mohapatra, Minister of Cultural Affairs and Civil Supplies, Government of Orissa, and Shri. Aniruddha Das, Secretary to the Government of Orissa, Department of Education and Cultural Affairs. My thanks are due to the Superintendent of the State Museum, Padmaśrī Paramānanda Ācārya, and Shri. Dāmodara Paṇḍā, who have helped me by supplying valuable information. Last, but not least, I must express my appreciation of the manifold help rendered to me by Pt. Nīḷamaṇi Miśra, B.O.L., Sāhityācārya, Curator of the Manuscript Section of the State Museum, particularly in making my stay in Bhubaneshwar as comfortable as possible. My assistant, Shri. Pramod Ranjan Ray, M.A., who comes from Orissa and who is a Ph.D. (Sanskrit) student of the Poona University and Junior Research Fellow at the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, was very helpful to me throughout my tour of Orissa.

Before concluding this Report, I should like to write a few words on the practical outcome of my visit, and also to record my impressions regarding the Atharvan tradition in Orissa in particular and the Vedic tradition in general.

My chief aim in visiting Orissa was the search of rare Vedic manuscripts, particularly of the Paippalāda Atharvan texts. I could trace some manuscripts even though I could not procure any. The text – rather a group of texts –, of which several manuscripts are

available in Orissa, is the Ātharvaṇa Upaniṣads. Some of these Upaniṣads are already published. However, as I have said earlier, a comprehensive study of these Upaniṣads with the help of the Orissan manuscripts needs to be undertaken. The ĀṅgirasaKalpa, which is one of the five Kalpas belonging to the AtharvaVeda of the Paippalādas, is still unpublished. Four manuscripts of this text are available in Bhubaneshwar. A thorough study of this text is likely to shed important light on our understanding of the Paippalāda AtharvaVeda. The third work pertaining to the Paippalāda literature is a collection of the Prayogas relating to the domestic rites of the Paippalādas. It is hoped that these Prayogas will soon become available in printed form. Some efforts will have to be made for the accomplishment of this last mentioned task.

I had wished to be able to trace the Śrauta texts belonging to the Paippalādas, namely the Brāhmaṇa and the ŚrautaSūtra. The sources which I could tackle did not give any indication of the existence of these texts. In fact I could not find any trace of the Śrauta ritual tradition among the AtharvaVedins. There is evidence to show that the tradition of the sacrificial rituals existed in Orissa upto the seventeenth century. But it appears that the AtharvaVedins were in no way associated with that tradition. It is a fact that the AtharvaVedins in Orissa never enjoyed the same status as that enjoyed by those belonging to the other three Vedas for reason of the exorcistic practices in which they indulged.

One need not, however, be disappointed in this respect. It may still be possible to discover more Atharvan texts in Orissa for two reasons:

(i) There are at least two manuscript collections in Orissa which have not been inspected so far. The first is the collection of Praphulla Bhañja at Bāripadā, earlier mentioned by me, and the second is that of the Maharaja of Khalikoṭa in Ganjam (Gañjāma) district.

(ii) There are several families of the AtharvaVedins in the remote corners of Orissa whom nobody has approached so far. Efforts are being made by the State Museum and the Universities in Orissa to collect manuscripts. Recently a University has been established in Berhampore (Brahmapura), the headquarters of Ganjam district. This University has opened a manuscript department. It may be hoped that more manuscripts will be discovered in course of time as a result of the manifold efforts being made in Orissa. Attempts at discovering manuscripts can be made only by the people and institutions of Orissa. In the nature of things it is difficult for others to undertake the work without adquate help of the people of Orissa. Any attempts to collect the manuscripts and other materials of historical interest have obviously to be made without any further delay, lest whatever remains is likely to be lost for ever as a result of the negligence on the part of their owners. Regarding the preservation of manuscripts in Orissa, the fact is to be noted that many manuscripts have been lost as a result either of floods or of fire. The rivers in Orissa are generally shallow, and as a result of heavy rain--fall in the rainy season they are often flooded, and the flood-water enters the houses, and renders everything in the houses out of use. The houses in Orissan villages are mostly made of wood and grass and consequently very much liable to catch fire. There have been several instances in which manuscripts in the houses of Brāhmaṇas were destroyed either by floods or by fire. Of course it is not unlikely that those who do not want to part with their manuscripts may hide behind such an excuse.

In Orissa one can come across the traditions of all the four Vedas in more or less proportion. The majority of the Brāhmaṇas belong to the Kāṇva recension of the ŚuklaYajurVeda. Next would come the Paippalāda AtharvaVedins. The SāmaVedins of Orissa belong to the Kauthuma recension. Lastly, a few Brāhmaṇas studying the Śākala recension may also be met with. As in other parts of the country, in Orissa too, Brāhmaṇas belonging to the different Vedic recensions were granted lands and villages by the ruling princes during the last few centuries, as were given also to members of the other social orders. In Orissa, a village granted to a Brāhmaṇa is called a "Śāsana", that granted to a Kṣatriya is called a "Gaṛa", and that granted to a Vaiśya is called a "Pura" or "Pattana". These lands have been held so far by the descendants of those to whom they were granted. Land-grants were made also to the AtharvaVedins by the ruling princes, particularly because the former could serve the latter immensely in the fulfilment of their material desires. The

exorcistic rites which the Atharvans can perform was quite naturally one of the big needs of the ruling princes. The close association of an Atharvan with a ruling prince can be traced back to the Vedic period. Even at present, the AtharvaVedins in Orissa perform the rites prescribed in the ĀṅgirasaKalpa and other similar works.

The Paippalāda AtharvaVedins of Orissa are restricted to only a few surnames, namely, "Upādhyāya", "Paṇḍā", "Kara" and "Miśra".**** They belong to specific gotras. Thus the Upādhyāyas belong to the gotras of Kāpya, Śāṇḍilya, Vātsa and Kumuda. Many of them belong to the Kāpyasa (= Kāśyapa?) gotra. The Paṇḍās belong to the gotras of Kāpya, Vātsa and Bharadvāja. Many of them belong to the Kāpyasa gotra. The Karas belong to the Parāśara gotra, and the Miśras to the Hārīta gotra. There is one more surname, namely, Praharāja, which has some history. Originally the Praharājas were Upādhyāyas. It was the custom in Orissa that when any prince died, his son or immediate heir was not appointed as a successor immediately. During the short period intervening between the time of death of a prince and the time of the consecration of the real heir, a person probably belonging to the AtharvaVeda was appointed to succeed the dead prince so that he may inherit the evil deeds, if any, of the dead prince. He was made the prince for a short time, namely, a "prahara" (= three hours). Consequently he was called "Praharā-rājan" (= Praharāja). Of course, land and other property were granted to him for this function. The descendants of such a Praharā-rājan are Praharājas. Outside the AtharvaVedins, there are certain Brāhmaṇa families whose origin is full of historical interest. Orissa offers rich field for the study of the growth of Brāhmaṇism.

I would like to refer here to a point of some historical interest, namely, whether the Paippalāda AtharvaVedins settled in Orissa since old days when the Vedic Aryans arrived there in the course of their migrations, or whether they came to Orissa from another part of India at a later time. The latter alternative would first come to one's mind in view of the fact that, according to Jonarāja, the author of RājaTaraṅgiṇī, the Paippalāda AtharvaVedins were brought to Kash-mir from Karṇāṭadeśa by the king of Kashmir. This is why a manuscript of the Paippalāda AtharvaVeda was first discovered in Kashmir. In the light of this evidence one may say that the Paippalāda

AtharvaVedins might have gone to Orissa from Karṇāṭadeśa in the fifteenth century A.D., when Puruṣottamadeva and Pratāparudradeva of Orissa attacked the kingdom of Vijayanagara and defeated the king. Many Paippalāda Atharvan families might have moved to Orissa at the invitation of the petty States and might have settled there where at present their descendants are living. But this surmise does not stand in view of the fact that copper-plate grants were made to Paippalāda Brāhmaṇas residing in the different districts of Bengal as early as the eleventh and twelfth centuries***** by the kings of Bengal. It is well-known that the cultural background of Atharvan hymns coincides with the geographical situation in Bengal. This would mean that the Paippalāda Atharvans might have settled in Orissa from the very first. As regards the settlement of the Atharvans in Karṇāṭadeśa, it may be noted that Sāyaṇācārya managed to write a commentary on the Śaunaka recension of the AtharvaVeda. There is also evidence to show that during the well-known Durgādevī famine in the thirteenth century, several Śaunaka Atharvan families left Karṇāṭaka and settled in the Māṇadeśa of Maharashtra. Under these circumstances it is difficult to substantiate Jonarāja's statement that the Kashmir Paippalādas came from Karṇāṭadeśa. The problem of the history of the AtharvaVedins cannot be solved unless decisive stronger evidence is forthcoming.

Poona, dated the 7th February, 1969

Editorial notes

* This unpublished field-report (originally with the title: "A report on the Tour in Orissa for the search of rare Sanskrit Manuscripts – December 1968 - January 1969"), of which I had a copy through the good offices of Arlo Griffiths (who had received it through the kind services of Prof. S.S. Bahulkar), has been printed, with the author's permission, in the present Volume, for the historical importance this may have. Diacritics have been added to the transliterations of place-names and personal names of traditional scholars etc. in the report with the assistance of the editor's M.A. students at the Visva-Bharati [University], Santiniketan, West Bengal, viz. Harekṛṣṇa Paṇḍā (from the village Āmbulakuṛā), Sureśacandra Maṇḍala (village Sāmanta Hātī) and Rāmeśbara Mohāḷika (village Aṭhiḷābāja), all from Balasore district in Northern Orissa, among whom Mr. Paṇḍā is a Paippalāda Brahmin.

** In 1973, the Orissa State Museum published an Alphabetical Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts, Part I, edited by Nilamani Mishra. Pp. 1-24, "Sl. No. 1-

-192", of this very poorly produced catalogue offer a first glimpse of the Museum's collection of Vedic manuscripts.

*** In 1988, Utkal University published A Descriptive Alphabetical Catalogue of Manuscripts (two parts in one volume), edited by Dr. A.K. Dev. Pp. 1-11, "Sl. No. 1-166", cover the Parija Library's Vedic collection.

**** Arlo Griffiths informs that (chiefly) among the northern branch of Orissa AtharvaVeda Brahmins, some other typical surnames such as Ratha, Pāṇigrāhī, i.a., are also found.

***** And even the tenth century: see the paper by Arlo Griffiths in this Volume, where reference is made to an inscription published recently in the Orissa Historical Research Journal 45 (2000) by S. Tripathy.

A List of Paippalāda-AtharvaVedin Settlements

according to field-notes by Michael Witzel (1983)
and Arlo Griffiths (1998-99, 1999, 2000-01, 2002)
with the assistance of Kunja Bihari Upadhyaya

This is a list of villages in Orissa (and Jharkhand) where we have personally met Brahmins belonging to the Paippalāda śākhā of the AtharvaVeda, or where Brahmins in other villages have told us that AtharvaVedic Brahmins are living. A first version of this list was written up by Witzel after his visit to Orissa in 1983. Additions and corrections were subsequently made by Griffiths using information gathered during his four field-trips in more recent years. Upadhyaya, himself an AtharvaVedic (Paippalāda) Brahmin originally hailing from the village Guhiāpāḷa, has over several years given generously of his time and of his knowledge about his tradition. He has also provided several additional names of villages, and helped us ascertain the correct spellings of village names. This is therefore a joint effort.

We publish this list in the hope that it may aid further studies on the living tradition of the Paippalāda śākhā, and its history. We have unfortunately not yet been able to visit all villages, in order to confirm and supplement the sometimes raw data offered here.

Names of villages appear in Indological transcription, and in Oriya alphabetical order. Those that appear with underlining have actually been visited by Witzel and/or Griffiths. For those villages that we have not been able to visit, we depend on oral information: if we have doubts about the accuracy or reliability of the information, we have marked this with "[?]".

Topographical indications are as precise as possible, but in some cases regrettably quite vague. The listed names of AtharvaVedic Brahmins are in most cases presently or formerly active priests, in particular owners of manuscript collections.

The references to colophons of manuscripts for the Paippalāda-Saṃhitā are take from Griffiths's forthcoming paper on "The Orissa Manuscripts of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā", forthcoming in Zeitschrift

der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 153 (2003). We also refer occasionally to Kashikar's field-report, which has been printed in this Volume.

The main list is followed by two brief lists of (I) titles, and (II) gotras of present-day AtharvaVedic Brahmins of the Paippalāda śākhā.

***

Aṇḍarā (2 KM North of **Dahisaṛā**)

*Kṛṣṇa Upādhyāya [?]

Asimiḷā (25 KM South of Balasore, just beyond Bāhānagā, left turn just after **Ichāpura,** after the powerplant)

*Dāmodara Miśra (Vātsasa gotra), Nīḷamaṇi Upādhyāya

Āmbuāposi (6 KM North-East of Keonjhar, just off Highway)

*Raghunātha Paṇḍā (late), Vīrabhadra Paṇḍā, Dhīrendra Paṇḍā

Āmbulakuṛā (near **Āḷadā**)

Āladā (15 KM from Balasore, left turn from National Highway heading to **Bāripadā**; opposite the river, with **Mākandā**, from **Āmbulakuṛā** and **Kaṇṭhipura**)

⇒Witzel, Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 44.1 (1985), p. 287

*Divākara Paṇḍā (Bharadvāja gotra)

Ichāpura (25 KM South of Balasore, just beyond Bāhānagā, turn left just before **Asimiḷā**)

Upādhyāya Śāsana [see **Harasapura**]

Ekacāliā (near Pipili; 20 KM South of Bhubaneswar, West side of main road)

*Gadādhara Miśra (late), Śrīnivāsa Upādhyāya (late, Kumuda gotra)

*Gadādhara Upādhyāya (late, Kumuda gotra); his sons are Lokanātha Upādhyāya (now in **Bālisāhi**), Viśvanātha Upādhyāya, Kāśīnātha Upādhyāya

Oṛagām̐ (30 KM South of Nayagarh)

*Subhāṣacandra Upādhyāya

Oḷakaṇā (near **Baḷabhadrapura**)

Kacuā (near **Kām̐thi**, West Bengal)

*Anantanārāyaṇa Paṇḍā

Kañci (some KMs from the main road North of **Puri**)

*Bāluṅkeśvara Praharāj, Nirañjana Praharāj (Śāṅkhāyana gotra), Raghunātha Upādhyāya (Kātyāyana gotra)

Kaṇṭhipura (near **Āḷadā**)

Kadaḷiā (near **Baiśiṅgā**, Mayurbhanj Dt.)

⇒Witzel 1985, p. 287

Kanhaï Vidyādharapura (Puri Dt.)

[No AtharvaVeda Brahmins left in 1983]

Kalyāṇapura (near **Mākandā**)

Kāṭhapāḷa (near **Bāṛiā**, and the Soṇa river, in Balasore Dt.)

Kām̐thi (village in West Bengal, Midnapore Dt.)

Kāḷimāṭi (very near **Guhiāpāḷa**)

Kāśī Jagannāthapura (some KMs West of Bhubaneswar-Puri road, South of **Nirmaḷā**)

[In 1983, Raghunātha Upādhyāya from **Jagannāthapura** and his son Satyapriya Upādhyāya were living here. In January 1999, Griffiths and Upadhyaya were not able to locate any Atharva-Veda Brahmins in this village]

Kuām̐sa (near Bhadrakh)

*Ravīndrakumāra Kara

Kukurājujhā (Post: Muṇḍhākaṭā, East-Singhbhum, Jharkhand, near **Guhiāpāḷa**)

*Praphulla Upādhyāya

Kuṛiā (West of Balasore town, just across Balanga river)

*Rāmacandra Paṇḍā (Bharadvāja gotra)

Kuruṃcaini (near Banki, on South shore of the Mahanadi)

*Harihara Upādhyāya (Kāśyapa gotra), Pūrṇacandra Upādhyāya

Kul'gi (Keonjhar Dt.)

Kuhlāṛa (near **Bhañjanagara**)

*Sureśacandra Upādhyāya, Dāmodara Upādhyāya

Keśarīpura (near Sora, on the bank of the Sālandī river [?])

*Gajendra Paṇḍā

Korapīṭhā (near **Oṛagāṁ**)

*Laṛukeśvara Upādhyāya

Khaṇḍadeuḷā (near **Mānagovindapuṛa**, **Nīḷagiri**, Balasore Dt.)

Khaṇḍapaṛā(gaṛa) (Nayagarh Dt., not far from South shore of Mahanadi)

⇒K.C. Acharya, Some Observations on the Kashmirian Atharvaveda, Book Two (Cuttack, Vidyapuri 1972), p. 1

*Māgauṇī Miśra (late)

Gaṅgāpura (Ganjam Dt. [?])

Gajiṛi (Mayurbhanj Dt.)

⇒field-report Kashikar

*Pūrṇacandra Paṇḍā (now in **Sāgrāmapura**), Cittarañjana Paṇḍā, Vijaya Paṇḍā

Gumurā (near Keonjhar)

Guhliāpāla (East-Singhbhum Dt., Jharkhand, 9 KM North of Baharāgoṛā, on bank of Subarnarekha river)

⇒D. Bhattacharyya, Our Heritage 5 (1957), p. 81 and Witzel 1985, p. 287

*Vidyādhara Paṇḍā (late) and his sons Śrīpati & Śrīdhara Paṇḍā (Kāpyasa gotra)

*Rāmacandra Paṇḍā (late) and his brother Kṛṣṇacandra Paṇḍā (Kāpyasa gotra)

*Antaryāmī Upādhyāya (Vātsasa gotra)

*Sudhākara Paṇḍā (Kāśyapa gotra)

*Pārthasārathi Miśra and his brother Aśoka Miśra (Hāritasya gotra)

*Ambujākṣa Upādhyāya and his brother Kṛṣṇacandra Upādhyāya (Vātsasa gotra)

Gelipur [= **Bandhaṭiā**] (half-way between Caṇḍīkhola and Bhadrakh, near Dhāmanagara bus stop)

*Kailāsa Pāṛhī

Geluṭiā (near Bhadrakh, 3 KM from **Carampā** station)

⇒field-report Kashikar. Info 2002: 3-4 houses in "Upādhyāyaśāhi"

*Sudarśana Upādhyāya, Nava Upādhyāya

Gokuḷapura (Puri Dt. [?])

Goṛipadara [= **Divyasiṃhapura**] (near Nirākārapura, Khurda Dt.)

*Lakṣmaṇa Upādhyāya, Baḷabhadra Upādhyāya

Goruāla (West of **Puri**, near **Taraṇa**)

*Prahlāda Miśra (late) and his sons Pūrṇacandra, Manu & Raghunātha Miśra

*Narasiṃha Miśra, Kṛṣṇacandra Paṇḍā

Gohaḷāmuṇḍā (near Śirṣā, Post: Rājālokā, Mayurbhanj Dt.)

Gharaṛiā (near Narsinghpur, Cuttack Dt., North side of Mahanadi)

*Dīnabandhu Upādhyāya, Vāsudeva Upādhyāya

Ghoṛāpadā (Balasore Dt. [?])

Candrābāṛi (Balasore Dt. [?])

Carampā (near Bhadrakh, one KM from railway station of same name)

⇛ field-report Kashikar

Churuṇī (Mayurbhanj Dt.)

*Kāḷi Miśra (late) and his son Devānanda Miśra

Cheḷiā (Mayurbhanj Dt.)

Jagannāthapura (Post: Haripur, via Pipili)

⇛Bhattacharyya, Paippalāda Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda, First Kāṇḍa (1964), p. xviii

*Raghunātha Upādhyāya, Padmanābha Upādhyāya (Kāśyapa gotra), Narahari Upādhyāya, Dayānidhi Upādhyāya

Jagamohana (near Muṇḍamarei, on the road from Asika to Dharākoṭ, Ganjam Dt.)

*Sāheba Bhaṭṭa

Jaraṛihā (Post: Aṅgārapaṛā, East-Singhbhum Dt., Jharkhand)

Jāgamarā (near Khaṇḍagiri, Bhubaneswar)

Jāguleipadā (near Rājakaṇikā, Balasore Dt. [?])

Jām'bani (Post: Aṅgārapaṛā, East-Singhbhum Dt., Jharkhand, 4 KM from **Guhiāpāḷa**)

Jiuli (= Vīrayadunāthapuraśāsana, 27 KM North-East of Keonjhar, 4 KM from highway intersection at Caṛheibhoḷa)

*Haḷadhara Paṇḍā (deceased 1999) and his son Ānandacandra Paṇḍā, Kāmapāla Paṇḍā, Bhagavān Paṇḍā

*Umākānta Paṇḍā, now living in Sutei near Balasore (Vātsasa gotra)

Jemādeipura (Ganjam Dt., from Asika, turn right over bridge to Bālipadara, turn right off main street, then another 8 KM, turn right at bend of road)

*Surendra Upādhyāya, Mahendra Upādhyāya

Jośipura (Puri Dt. [?])

Ḍiā (village near **Puri** [?])

Ḍimiri (10 KM from **Pahaṅgā**, between Bhubaneswar and Cuttack: Phulanakharā bus-stop)

Ḍerābiśi (near Bhubaneswar [?])

Tarana (West of **Puri**, 3 KM past **Goruāḷa**, to the right)

*1983: Nirākāra Paṇḍā, Yadunātha Paṇḍā. 2000: Saccidānanda Upādhyāya, Gaurāṅga Upādhyāya

Taḷāṅga (near Bhadrakh)

⇛field-report Kashikar; colophons of PaippalādaSaṃhitā mss.

*Baḷabhadra Upādhyāya (late [?]), Vaṃśīdhara Upādhyāya, Śrīdhara Upādhyāya, Śaśikānta Upādhyāya

Dahisarā (ca. 8 KM South of **Asimiḷā**, on West side of highway)

*Gajendra Upādhyāya

Divyasiṃhapura [= **Goṛipadara**]

⇛PaippalādaSaṃhitā ms. colophon (**JM**). 10 AtharvaVeda families left in 1983.

Nalabantā (just South of Asika, Ganjam Dt.)

*Kṛṣṇacandra Upādhyāya (Kāśyapa gotra)

Nārīpura (in Bhadrakh, near Draupadi Cinema)

Nirmalā (North of **Puri**, ca. 32 KM to the South of Bhubaneswar, to the East of main road)

*Maheśvara Miśra, Prahlāda Upādhyāya (Kāśyapa gotra)

Nīḷakaṇṭhapura (near Kendrapada)

Nīḷagiri (North of Balasore)

Nuāgāṁ (near **Remuṇā**)

*Pūrṇacandra Paṇḍā

Nodhā (near **Ḍimiri** and **Methikuṛā**)

Pahaṅgā (Cuttack Dt., between Cuttack and Bhubaneswar, near **Ḍimiri** and **Methikuṛā**, Niāḷi bus-stop)

Pārikula (9 KM North of Balasore)

⇒this appears to be the provenance of our ms. **Pa**, which found its way to **Baiśiṅgā**, then to **Puri**, and is now kept by A.K. Praharāj in **Bāripadā**. A modern copy of this ms., written by A.K. Praharāj, was kept at **Baiśiṅgā** (D. Paṇḍā) in 1983; A.K. Praharāj concurrently had made a carbon-copy from which a photocopy was made by Witzel in 1983 at **Bāripadā**, our **Pa**$_c$. The colophons to our **Pa** show that this ms. was not originally connected with **Pārikuḷa**.

*Dīnabandhu Upādhyāya

Pāruḷiā Śāsana (7 KM from **Guhiāpāḷa**, Post: Jām'śoḷā, via Baharāgoṛā, Jharkhand)

Pārvatīpura (half a KM from Narsinghpur, Cuttack Dt.)

*Gopana Upādhyāya (son of Jagannātha Upādhyāya)

Pitaḷa (near Asika, Ganjam Dt.)

*Lokanātha Upādhyāya

Puri

At the Kancikamakoti Matha on the Beach (near Swargadwar), the temple is being run by Śaśāṅkaśekhara Upādhyāya from **Guhiāpāḷa** (see Witzel 1985, p. 287).

At the Jagannātha temple, Gopīnātha Miśra Vedapāṭhī was said to know ṚgVeda, SāmaVeda, YajurVeda (Mādhyandina śākhā) and AtharvaVeda in 1983.

Peger'paṛā (22 KM from Balasore)

*Dīnabandhu Dāśa Śarmā

Pratimādeipura (Post: Patalipura, 5 KM from **Baiśiṅgā**)

*Dīnabandhu Paṇḍā, Pūrṇacandra Paṇḍā (Kāśyapa gotra)

Phulāṛi (5 KM North of Balasore)

Phulabāṇī (Kandhamal Dt.)

*Maheśvara Upādhyāya

Baïm̐cā (Balasore Dt. [?])

Bagamarā (near Bhadrakh)

*Navakiśora Paṇḍā, Bhagavān Paṇḍā, Arjuna Paṇḍā

Baṛakhiripadā (5 KM West from **Baiśiṅgā**)

Baṛapāḷa (Balasore Dt.)

*Vipracaraṇa Paṇḍā (Kumuda gotra)

Bandhaṭiā [= Gelipur]

Baḷabhadrapura (coming from Cuttack, 10 KM before Kendrapada)

*Lokanātha Miśra, Narasiṃha Miśra (both Hāritasya gotra); Saroja Paṇḍā

Bāṅgarācuṛā (near **Guhiāpāḷa**, East-Singhbhum Dt., Jharkhand)

Bāṛiā (Balasore Dt.)

Bāripadā

⇒see field-report Kashikar. The museum here (+ Jubilee Library) is said to own many mss. The museum is connected with the Raja of Mayurbhanj.

*Jayakṛṣṇa Paṇḍā (?), Ādityakumār Praharāj

Bālikuṭhi (51 KM North-East of Balasore town)

*Dr. Mṛtyuñjaya Paṇḍā (Bharadvāja gotra)

Bālisāhi (**Puri** town)

*Lokanātha "Kāḷu" Upādhyāya from **Ekacāḷiā** stays at Siddhabakuḷamaṭha

Biśoḷa (4 bus stops from Bhadrakh, on road to Mañjuri)

*Mūṣā Paṇḍā

Beṇāpurā (50 KM North from Balasore, on the West bank of the river Subarnarekha)

*Upendra Upādhyāya, Vaṃśīdhara Upādhyāya

Betanaṭī (Mayurbhanj Dt.)

⇒In 1983, Sadāśiva Ratha Śarmā informed Witzel that Bālasubrahmaṇyan Śāstrī from Tirupati was said to have taken a PaippalādaSaṃhitā ms. with him to Tirupati from here.

Baiśiṅgā (Mayurbhanj Dt.)

⇒In 1983, 20 families performed traditional rituals.

*Dāmodara Paṇḍā (late, Kāśyapa gotra): founded the now defunct Vedakarmakāṇḍa Vidyālaya in Padārpaṇiā, **Baiśiṅgā**. His son: Devadatta Paṇḍā

Bodāpāḷasā (Keonjhar Dt., near **Jiuḷi**)

⇒see colophon material in PaippalādaSaṃhitā ms. **Ji2**.

Bhañjanagara (Ganjam Dt.)

*Liṅgarāj Upādhyāya

Bheṭanaī (Ganjam Dt., just North of Asika)

*Śaśibhūṣaṇa Upādhyāya (late), Pītavāsa Upādhyāya (Śāṇḍilya gotra), Liṅgarāj Bhaṭṭa

Mahāntipaṛā (near **Remuṇā**)

⇒referred to as Mahantipura by Bhattacharyya 1964, p. xviii

*Yadunātha Paṇḍā (late), Umākānta Upādhyāya

Mahumuhāṇa (near Bāguṛi, 7 KM from Sora, North of Bhadrakh, on the road to Maṅgalapur)

*Harekṛṣṇa Upādhyāya

Mākandā (next to Āḷadā)

⇒field-report Kashikar, and Bhattacharyya 1964, p. xviii; colophons of PaipplādaSaṃhitā mss.

*Padmalābha Upādhyāya (late); Gaṅgādhara Upādhyāya, son of late Cakradhara Upādhyāya (Śāṇḍilya gotra)

Mānagovindapura (near **Nīḷagiri**, North of Balasore)

Māndhātā (51 KM North of Balasore, 2 KM from Lāṅgaleśvara)

*late Kṛpāsindhu Paṇḍā (Bharadvāja gotra)

Māndhātāpura (near Nayagarh town)

⇒mentioned in the colophons to the PaippalādaSaṃhitā mss. **Ek2** and **V/130**

Mujāgaṛa (near **Bhañjanagara**)

*Praphullacandra Upādhyāya

Methikuṛā (next to **Pahaṅgā**)

Raisum̐ā (Keonjhar Dt.)

*One AtharvaVeda family, interestingly bearing the name Ratha (info. **Jiuḷi**)

Rājendrapura (Ganjam Dt. [?])

Rāṇībandha (Mayurbhanj Dt., near **Gajiṛi**)

⇒field-report Kashikar

Remuṇā (just North of Balasore)

Vajragumā (also called **Vajrakoṭ**, near **Bheṭanaī**)

*Nṛsiṃha Bhaṭṭa

Vāsudevapura (big Śāsana village West of **Puri**)

⇒Bhattacharyya 1964, p. xix

*1983: Baḷabhadra Upādhyāya, Lokanātha "Kāḷu" Upādhyāya (see **Ekacāḷiā**). 2000: Pūrṇacandra Upādhyāya, Dīnabandhu Upādhyāya

Śrī Mukundapura ([?])

⇒no AtharvaVeda Brahmins left in 1983

Saṅkhāmāri (5 KM from Baṛambā, before Narsinghpur, Cuttack Dt.)

*Vaidyanātha Paṇḍā (Vātsasa gotra), and his son Mṛtyuñjaya Paṇḍā

Sāgrāmapura (20 KM from Baḷasore, via **Remuṇā**)

*Pūrṇacandra Paṇḍā

Sāṅgulāi (near **Ekacāḷiā**, East side of main road)

Siuḷā Śāsana (near **Sāṅguḷāi**)

Siṅgiri Śāsana (near Bālipaṭaṇā, Bāḷakāṭi, South of Bhubaneswar, across the Dayā river)

*Śyāma Miśra, Udāyatana Miśra (both Hāritasya gotra)

Siṇidhiā (near **Kuṛiā**, just across the Balanga river)

Simāpura (Mayurbhanj Dt. [?])

Siliṇḍā (Balasore Dt. [?])

[?] **Silimaposi** (near Khiching, Mayurbhanj Dt.)

*Pūrṇacandra Miśra (not belonging to AtharvaVeda?)

Soṛaka (Ganjam Dt.)

*Kāśīnātha Upādhyāya

Harasapura [= **Upādhyāya Śāsana**] (near Keonjhar)

Haridāsapura (near Banki, Cuttack Dt. [?])

Haripura (Balasore Dt. [?])

Harṣapurā (near **Remuṇā**)

*Pramoda Paṇḍā

***

I: List of Titles (cf. Kashikar's field-report)

Three titles are found throughout the area: Upādhyāya, Paṇḍā, Miśra (Miśras mostly belong to the Hāritasya gotra).

To our knowledge, the following titles are restricted in occurrence: Pāṇigrāhī (village **Bāṅgarācuṛā**), Mahāpātra (villages **Sāgrāmapura**, **Goṛipadara**), Dāśa (**Pegerpaṛā**), Pāṛhī (**Bandhaṭiā**), Praharāj (**Pāruḷiā Śāsana**, **Kañci**), Pati (**Nīḷagiri** area), Kara (**Nīḷagiri** area, Bhadrakh area), Bhaṭṭa (Ganjam Dt.: Dharākoṭ kingdom), Ratha (around Keonjhar [?]).

II: List of Gotras

Kātyāyana, Kāpyasa (s p e l l i n g?), Kāśyapa, Kumuda/Kumudesa (s p e l l i n g?), Kauṇḍanasya (s p e l l i n g?), Parāśara (see ms. **Ku1**), Bharadvāja, Vātsasa (s p e l l i n g?), Śāṅkhāyana, Śāṇḍilya, Hāritasya (s p e l l i n g?)

Acknowledgment

After the last period of fieldwork on which this report is based was completed, a few details were kindly checked by the editor in consultation with his M.A. students of the Visva-Bharati [University], Santiniketan, West Bengal, viz. Harekṛṣṇa Paṇḍā (from the village Āmbulakuṛā), Sureśacandra Maṇḍaḷa (village Sāmanta Hātī) and Rāmeśbara Mohāḷika (village Aṭhiḷābāja), all from Bāleśbara (Balasore) district in Northern Orissa, among whom Mr. Paṇḍā is a Paippalāda Brahmin.

Editor's note

At the request of Arlo Griffiths, the full apparatus of diacritics has not been used in this report in the transliteration of more or less well-known place-names: i.e., the spellings of bigger place-names with (more or less) standardized Romanizations are left as seen, e.g. Balasore, Bhadrakh, Puri, Cuttack, etc., and, the inter-vocalic *y* has not been written as *ẏ* (as it appears in Oriya alphabet) in Oriya proper names. Against the norm of the Oriya alphabet, sometimes *v* has been differentiated from *b* in proper names. In all, the Sanskrit way of spelling has mostly been followed.

Appendix

(German original of the paper by Klaus Mylius)

Philosophische Probleme der Hymne an die Zeit

(Kālasūkta: AtharvaVeda Śaunaka 19.53, Paippalāda 11.8)

Wann hat im alten Indien philosophisches Denken eingesetzt? Zur Lösung dieser Frage haben Indologen und Philosophen nicht wenig Material beigebracht, doch endgültig geklärt wurde sie bisher nicht. In der vorliegenden Betrachtung gehen wir davon aus, dass Philosophie bedeutet, das Verhältnis des Menschen zur Welt rational zu erklären. Über die dazu erforderliche Abstraktionstätigkeit schrieb Helmuth von Glasenapp treffend: "Alles philosophische Denken beginnt mit dem Bestreben, die unendliche Fülle der Erscheinungen auf eine begrenzte Zahl von Dingen zurückzuführen."[1]

Angesichts der Schwierigkeit und Komplexität dieser Problematik ergibt sich die Notwendigkeit, **alle** relevanten Texte der Primärliteratur einschlägig zu analysieren. Die atharvanische "Hymne an die Zeit" ist jedoch philosophisch bisher kaum erforscht worden. Auch der Verfasser maßt sich nicht an, eine abschließende Untersuchung vorzulegen; er beschränkt sich darauf, kommenden Forschergenerationen einige inhaltliche und methodologische Anregungen zu übermitteln.[2]

Im elften Buch seiner "Bekenntnisse" fragt Augustinus: "Quid est ergo tempus?" = "Was ist also Zeit?" Auf diese Frage werden wir im Folgenden näher einzugehen haben.[3] Eingangs sei bemerkt, dass Dietmar Köveker und Andreas Niederberger im Vorwort zu ihrer Ausgabe von Texten zur französischen Zeitphilosohie des 20. Jahrhunderts[4] betonen, dass der Satz "Die Zeit ist immer aktuell" falsch ist: "Seit Bergson ist sie (gemeint ist die französische Zeitphilosophie, K.M.) sich nämlich darin einig, dass die Zeit sich nicht auf das reduzieren lasse, was an ihr "aktuell", also gegenwärtig sei; denn wie entstünde sonst ihr virtuelles Gegenstück, die Vergangenheit; und woher käme die Zukunft?" Da die Zeit mithin Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft umfasst, ist ihr Unendlichkeit zu eigen, jedoch keine solche schlechthin, sondern eine spezifische Ausprägung der Unendlichkeit, auf die schon Friedrich Engels mit folgenden

Worten hingewiesen hat: "Ewigkeit in der Zeit ... besteht schon von vornherein ... darin, nach **keiner** Seite hin ein Ende zu haben, weder von vorn oder nach hinten, nach oben oder nach unten, nach rechts oder nach links. Diese Unendlichkeit ist eine ganz andre als die einer unendlichen Reihe, denn diese fängt von vornherein immer mit Eins, mit einem ersten Gliede an."[5] "Weil man in der Mathematik vom Bestimmten, Endlichen ausgehn muß, um zum Unbestimmten, Endlosen zu kommen, so müssen alle mathematischen Reihen, positive oder negative mit Eins anfangen, sonst kann man nicht damit rechnen."[6] Der Dialektiker Engels weiß: "Die Unendlichkeit **ist** ein Widerspruch, und voll von Widersprüchen. Es ist schon ein Widerspruch, daß eine Unendlichkeit aus lauter Endlichkeiten zusammengesetzt sein soll, und doch ist dies der Fall."[7] Davon ausgehend kommt Engels zu der für spätere Überlegungen wichtigen Unterscheidung zwischen dem **Zeitbegriff** und der **wirklichen Zeit**.[8] Heute ist nämlich klar, dass der zeitliche Ablauf nicht die Zeit selbst ist; diese ist mehr als ein Aggregat von Sequenzen. Die Zeit als solche hat keine Dimension, aber eben durch die Sequenzen erlangt sie Unendlichkeit. Man muss also unterscheiden zwischen der Zeit selbst und ihren Erscheinungsweisen, nämlich Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft.

Es ist wenig bekannt, dass altindische Philosophen schon sehr früh zu solchen Erkenntnissen gelangt sind. Kumārila wusste, dass das Wesen der Zeit von ihren Erscheinungen verschieden ist. Im ŚlokaVārttika 303 wird konstatiert, dass die Zeit ein und ewig ist, dass sie aber geteilt und vielfältig als Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft in Erscheinung tritt.

Am Schluss dieser einführenden Bemerkungen über das Wesen der Zeit können wir nicht umhin, hinzuzufügen, dass diese unabhängig von einer Registrierung durch den Menschen, unabhängig vom menschlichen Bewusstsein abläuft. Allein die geologischen Prozesse führen die These von Maurice Merleau-Ponty: "Die Zeit ist also kein realer Prozeß, keine tatsächliche Folge ... Sie entspringt **meinem** Verhältnis zu den Dingen"[9] ad absurdum.

Im Zusammenhang mit den vorstehenden Bemerkungen sollen nun die einzelnen Verse der Hymne AtharvaVeda Śaunaka 19.53 (= Paippalāda 11.8) auf ihren Inhalt und ihre Aussagekraft untersucht werden. Um der Nachprüfbarkeit willen wird jeweils die deutsche Übersetzung vorangestellt.

1. Die Zeit fährt dahin als Ross mit sieben Zügeln, tausendäugig, nicht alternd, samenreich. Es besteigen sie verzückte Seher; die Räder sind alle die Wesen.

Schon dieser erste Vers enthält bemerkenswerte philosophische Aussagen. Er reflektiert die Immanenz der Zeit: die Zeit "fährt dahin"; sie gilt als das bewegende Prinzip, als die **vis motrix**; als "samenreich" ist sie zugleich kreativ.[10] "Tausendäugig", also allseits, sieht sie die Welt. Besonders aufschlussreich ist, dass die Zeit und die Wesen als zusammengehörig betrachtet werden.

2. Mit sieben Rädern fährt diese Zeit; sieben sind ihre Naben; Unsterblichkeit ist gewiss die Achse. Allen Wesen ist die Zeit zugewandt. Sie eilt dehin als erster Gott.[11]

Hier drückt die Siebenzahl aus, dass die Zeit "alles" ist. Da Unsterblichkeit ihre Achse ist, besitzt sie Unendlichkeit. Dass sie allen Wesen zugewandt und doch auch abgewandt (Vers 3) ist, zeugt von dialektischem Denken. Wenn sie als erster Gott bezeichnet wird, deutet das hier auf ihre Transzendenz. Sie ist damit das Prinzip der Bewegung der Schöpfung, aber als deren erstes Prinzip selbst unerschaffen.

3. Ein volles Gefäß ist auf die Zeit gesetzt; das fürwahr sehen wir als vielfach existierend. Sie ist allen Wesen abgewandt; als Kāla bezeichnet man sie im höchsten Himmel.[12]

Immanenz und Transzendenz gelangen hier sozusagen zur Synthese. Auch hier verdient die dialektische Denkweise hervorgehoben zu werden.

4. Eben sie fügte die Wesen zusammen; eben sie umgab die Wesen. Vater seiend, wurde sie deren Sohn. Außer ihr gibt es fürwahr keinen höheren Glanz.

Der Grundgedanke aus Vers 3 wird hier fortgeführt. Die Zeit fügt alle Wesen zusammen und umgibt sie zugleich. Sie ist — wiederum in dialektischer Denkweise — Vater **und** Sohn, überweltlich-

-transzendent und innerweltlich-immanent.

5. Die Zeit hat jenen Himmel erzeugt, die Zeit auch diese Erden. Das Gewordene und das, was (noch) werden soll, breitet sich, angetrieben von der Zeit, aus.

Die Allmacht der Zeit beweist sich durch ihr Wirken in Vergangenheit, Gegenwart (Deixis in Bezug auf "jenen Himmel", "diese Erden") und Zukunft.

6. Die Zeit erschuf die Erde; in der Zeit glüht die Sonne. In der Zeit sind alle Wesen; in der Zeit blickt das Auge umher.

Hier werden Zeit und Licht beziehungsweise Sehen zusammengestellt. Die Zeit wird zu einer "Lichtung" des Seins.

Die Konzeption der Zeit als Schöpferin wird in der folgenden Hymne AtharvaVeda Śaunaka 19.54, Paippalāda 11.9 weitergeführt. Die dortigen Verse 1-2 mögen als Beispiel dienen:

> Aus der Zeit entstanden die Wasser, aus der Zeit (entstanden) das Bráhman, Hitze, die Himmelsgegenden. Durch die Zeit geht die Sonne auf, in der Zeit geht sie wieder unter. — Durch die Zeit weht der Wind; durch die Zeit (ist) die Erde groß; der große Himmel (ist) in der Zeit gegründet.

7. In der Zeit ist der Geist, in der Zeit ist der Atem; mit der Zeit ist der Name verbunden. Über die herangekommene Zeit freuen sich alle diese Geschöpfe.

Dieser Vers gibt eine Zusammenfassung: die Zeit erscheint als Seinsgrund, indem sie mit dem Atem als Lebensprinzip verbunden wird; sie ist aber in Konnex mit dem Geist auch Erkenntnisgrund.

8. In der Zeit ist Glut, in der Zeit ist das Beste; mit der Zeit ist das Bráhman verbunden. Die Zeit, welche der Vater des Prajāpati war, ist der Herr von allem.

Hier wird die mythische Gestalt des Prajāpati eingeführt. Dieser Vorgang ist möglicherweise ebenso eine spätere Zutat wie die Antwort "Prajāpati" in Vers 10 des Fragehymnus ṚgVeda 10.121. Erwähnt zu werden verdient in diesem Zusammenhang aber auch eine Bemerkung von Jean-François Lyotard: "Seit ihren Anfängen hat die Menschheit

ein spezifisches Mittel eingesetzt, das sich zur Kontrolle der Zeit eignet: die mythische Erzählung."[13] Die Einführung der Zeit als Maßstab des "Besten" und ihre Verbindung mit dem Bráhman könnten hier als Konzept einer axiologischen Dimension der Zeit aufgefasst werden. Das Verhältnis des Kāla zum Bráhman bedarf aber jedenfalls noch eingehender Untersuchung.

9. Von ihr entstandt, von ihr geboren, ist dies (alles) auf ihr gegründet. Nachdem die Zeit zum Bráhman geworden war, trägt sie den Höchsten.

Der Zusammenhang von Zeit und Bráhman wird hier zur Identität ausgeweitet.

10. Die Zeit erschuf die Geschöpfe, die Zeit (erschuf) am Anfang den Prajāpati. Der durch sich selbst seiende Kaśyapa wurde aus der Zeit, die Glut aus der Zeit geboren.[14]

Auch hier schließt sich an die philosophische Aussage eine mythologische Betrachtung sozusagen als Appendix an. Zu dem hier in ersten Umrissen reflektierten Verhältnis des Bráhman zu Prajāpati äußerte sich Walter Ruben wie folgt: "Bei den Kosmogonien der Brāhmaṇas nun kann man zwei Typen unterscheiden. Die einen beginnen die Weltschöpfung mit einem Gotte. Der Gott ist ... ein neuer Gott, der "Herr der Wesen", Prajāpati, genannt wird, ein von den Priestern offenbar neu geschaffener Demiurg ... Einige dieser Brahmanen aber ... gingen noch weiter und behaupteten, ... ihr Brahmanen-Charisma, das bráhman, ihre magische Macht als solche hätte am Anfang der Schöpfung gestanden und hätte statt eines Gottes die Schöpfung geleistet."[15]

Fasst man alle oben genannten Umstände zusammen, so zögert man nicht festzustellen, dass Lucian Scherman unseren Text mit vollem Recht nicht zu den mythologischen, sondern zu den philosophischen Hymnen gezählt hat.[16] Diese Auffassung war jedoch bis lang nicht unumstritten. Eine gewichtige Gegenstimme kam von W. Ruben, den wir wie folgt zitieren: "Zum Philosophieren, d.h. zum unmythologischen, unmagischen, gedanklichen Formulieren derartiger Grundsätze letzter Abstraktion, kam man erst ein paar Jahrhunderte später, als die Klassengesellschaft ausgebildet war ... und zwar bei

gegenseitiger Polemik. Für solche Polemik war aber im RV und AV noch keine Gelegenheit ...".[17]

Diese Worte beziehen sich auf die einander entgegengesetzten philosophischen Standpunkte des Uddālaka Āruṇi und des Yājñavalkya in der Chāndogya- und der BṛhadĀraṇyaka-Upaniṣad. So treffend sie dort sind, können sie umfassende Gültigkeit jedoch nur dann beanspruchen, wenn man den Bereich der Philosophie auf die Erkenntnistheorie beschränkt, in der das Verhältnis des Geistes zur Materie, des Denkens zum Sein unbestritten ein zentrales Problem bildet.

Eine weitere wichtige These Rubens muss hier ebenfalls erwähnt werden; sie betrifft den Zusammenhang zwischen Philosophie und Polemik: "Ohne Polemik ... ist keine Wissenschaft und keine Philosophie möglich. Das Auftreten der Polemik muß man also, wenn man einen Anfang der Philosophie herausstellen will, sorgsam beachten."[18]

Wertet man Polemik als ein Kriterium für philosophisches Denken, so kann man allerdings nicht umhin festzustellen, dass es schon im indischen Geistesleben der ältesten überlieferten Zeit Polemik gegeben haben muss. Die berühmte Hymne ṚgVeda 10.129 ist von Polemik durchdrungen; auch die Fragehymne ṚgVeda 10.121 ("Wer ist der Gott, dass wir ihm opfernd dienen?") ist eine gegen bestehende Anschauungen gerichtete Polemik. Was nun unsere "Hymne an die Zeit" betrifft, so können wir ex silentio nicht schließen, dass es um sie keine Polemik gegeben hätte. Wenn also Ruben den Beginn der indischen Philosophie in die ältesten Upaniṣaden verlegt, dann — dies lässt sich rekapitulierend sagen — kann ein solches Postulat nur für den bereich der Erkenntnistheorie Gültigkeit beanspruchen.

Zu betonen bleibt, dass zwischen philosophischen Ideen und philosophischen Systemen unterschieden werden muss. Mikrosysteme kann man bereits in den ältesten Upaniṣaden und im Jinismus eruieren, doch ausgebildete Systeme erscheinen erst in den **Darśanas**. Aber dass philosophische (und nicht nur kosmogonische) **Ideen** bereits im ṚgVeda widergespiegelt werden, kann angesichts des Nachdenkens über sat und a-sat in 10.129 nicht mehr ernsthaft in

Abrede gestellt werden. Gerade die in 10.129.6 getroffene Feststellung, wonach die Götter selbst zum Geschaffenen gehören, führt weit über die Beschränktheit des in der Mythologie befangenen Denkens hinaus.

Alles Gesagte zusammenfassend, ist zu konstatieren, dass sich die atharvanische "Hymne an die Zeit" weitgehend aus der Mythologie gelöst hat. Wo letztere in Erscheinung tritt, hat sie den Charakter einer (späteren) Zutat oder einer Konzession an den "Zeitgeist". In allen Grundaussagen hat AtharvaVeda Śaunaka 19.53 = Paippalāda 11.8 philosophischen Charakter. Die Hymne ist ein eindrucksvoller, ja bewundernswerter Versuch, das Phänomen der Zeit rational zu erklären. Ihre Hauptthemen sind Immanenz und Transzendenz, die Funktion der Zeit als Seins- und Erkenntnisgrund. Fast drei Jahrtausende hat das Abendland gebraucht, um — auf anderen Wegen — die von dem atharvanischen Denker erreichten Höhen erneut zu erklimmen. Allein diese Feststellung sollte für die junge Generation von Indologen und Philosophen Ansporn sein, ihre Kräfte für die weitere und nun gemeinsame Erforschung des philosophischen Denkens in vedischer Zeit zusammenzufassen.

Anmerkungen

[1] Glasenapp, H. von: Die Philosophie der Inder (Stuttgart 1949), S. 26-27.

[2] In diesem Zusammenhang spricht der Verfasser den Herren Dr. Lars Göhler (Leipzig) und Alexander Fidora, M.A. (Frankfurt am Main) für ihre wertvollen Hinweise seinen herzlichen kollegialen Dank aus.

[3] Zur weiteren Vertiefung sei verwiesen auf Mittelstaedt, P.: Der Zeitbegriff in der Physik. Physikalische und philosophische Untersuchungen zum Zeitbegriff in der klassischen und in der relativistischen Physik (Mannheim 1976).

[4] Köveker, D. und Niederberger, A. (Hrsg.): ChronoLogie. Texte zur französischen Zeitphilosophie des 20. Jahrhunderts (Darmstadt 2000).

[5] Engels, F.: Herrn Eugen Dührings Umwälzung der Wissenschaft (Berlin 1952), S. 58.

[6] Ebenda, S. 60.

[7] Ebenda, S. 60-61.

[8] Ebenda, S. 61.

[9] Merleau-Ponty, M.: Phénoménologie de la Perception (Paris 1945), deutsch von Rudolf Boehm (Berlin 1966), zitiert nach Köveker/Niederberger (s. Anm. 4), S. 78.

[10] Später wird dieser Gedanke erneuert: in Bhartṛharis KālaSamuddeśa gilt die Vielfalt als Produkt der Zeit.

[11] īyate nach E. Leumann "wird angefleht"; doch ist "moves onward" nach J. Muir jedenfalls vorzuziehen. arvāk und pratyák sind als richtige Lesarten beizubehalten.

[12] tam könnte sich auf kāla u n d kumbha beziehen; bei Muir bezieht es sich auf kāla, bei J. Grill und Leumann auf kumbha. Nach A. Ludwig ist kumbha hier die Sonne.

[13] Lyotard, J.-F.: L'Inhumaine. Causeries sur le temps (Paris 1988), zitiert nach Köveker/Niederberger (s. Anm. 4), S. 209.

[14] Kaśyapa ist ein göttliches Wesen neben oder identisch mit Prajāpati.

[15] Ruben, W.: Einführung in die Indienkunde (Berlin 1954), S. 117.

[16] Scherman, L.: Philosophische Hymnen aus der Rig- und Atharva-Veda--Sanhitâ verglichen mit den Philosophemen der älteren Upanishad's (Straßburg 1887), abgedruckt in: Lucian Scherman, Kleine Schriften (= Glasenapp-Stiftung, Band 40), herausgegeben von F. Wilhelm (Stuttgart 2001).

[17] Ruben, W.: Geschichte der indischen Philosophie (Berlin 1954), S. 65-66.

[18] Ruben, W.: Einführung in die Indienkunde (Berlin 1954), S. 118.

Herausgeberanmerkungen

Der Autor dieses Aufsatzes hat dem Herausgeber freundlicherweise erlaubt, den entsprechenden Mantras der Śaunaka-Version in Klammern die Nummern der Paippalāda-Version (nach Bhattacharya 1997) beizugeben.

Index Locorum

List of Sanskrit Text-Places

Figures to the left of the dots refer to Sanskrit text-places. – Figures to the right of the dots indicate page numbers. – References only to kāṇḍas (or similar primary divisions with other nomenclatures) have been excluded. – Names of texts appear in Sanskrit alphabetical order.

– Editor

AtharvaVeda

See under PaippalādaSaṃhitā, Śaunaka-Saṃhitā

AtharvaVedaPariśiṣṭa[s]

1.colophon 142
2.3.5 143
2.4.3 ..... 147f.
2.4.5 ..... (136), 143 (n. 4)
2.6.1 143
8.colophon; 19.1.1; 23.13.4; 25.1.1 142
25.1.10, 11 ..... 144 (n. 8)
30.1.1 142
31.8.4, 5; 31.9.2, 4, 5 137
35.1 136
35.2.9 ..... (137), 144 (n. 5)
35.2.11 137
35.6, 8 136
35.18, 19 137
35.109 136
36.2.2 ..... (137), 144 (n. 6)
36.9 ..... 144 (n. 7)
36.19.1 137
39.1.1; 43.4.53; 46.5.1 142

AtharvaVeda-PrayogaBhānu

beginning 152
1.2 153
1.35 152
2, p. 33 151
2.9 153

AtharvaVedaPrātiśākhya

3.72 (comm.) 126

ArthaŚāstra

1.3.1 154
1.3.2 ..... 30, 154
1.3.4 154
14.146 30

ĀpastambaGṛhyaSūtra

3.9.6 29

ĀpastambaŚrautaSūtra

1.12.17 ..... 70 (n. 11)
10.9.5 108
22.5.4 101

ĀśvalāyanaGṛhyaSūtra

1.17.5-7 101

ĀśvalāyanaŚrautaSūtra

5.13.15 109
6.9.1, 2 29

ṚgVeda

1.23.19bc 105
1.36.10 47
1.67.3 116
1.68.4 113
1.69.1 117

1.80.16 33
1.114.10 ..... 95 (n. 73)
1.191.1 49
1.191 ..... 143 (n. 2)
2.42, 43; 3.53.12 ..... 143 (n. 2)
4.57.7 ..... 93 (n. 52)
4.58.3 ..... 95 (n. 78)
5.56.8 ..... 95 (n. 73)
5.57.5 113
6.47.24 34
6.62.5 116
6.75.15 125
7.19.9 ..... 90 (n. 7)
7.55.2-8 29
7.87 56
7.104.21-24 ..... 29, 143 (n. 2)
8.1.31 67
8.27.21 47
8.27.22 113
(comm.) ..... 120 (n. 16)
8.33.6 67
8.41.9 117
8.45.22; 9.86.43 96
10.14.6 33
10.30.4 106
10.34.5 114
10.67.10 96
10.95.12 106
10.97 29
10.121 ..... 76, 186
10.121.10 ..... 74, 184
10.129 ..... 76, 186(f.)
10.145.1; 10.155 29
10.162 ..... 143 (n. 2)
10.162.4 50
10.163 ..... 29, 143 (n. 2)
10.166.3 60
10.166.3b 59
10.173 28

AitareyaBrāhmaṇa

5.32 (25.7) 27
5.33 (25.8) 31
7.16 (33.4) 34
8.24-28 (40.1-5) 28

KāṭhakaSaṃhitā

1.1 67
13.14b 105
16.7d 107

KātyāyanaŚrautaSūtra

22.4.27, 28 101

KāmaSūtra

7.1.49 30

KenOpaniṣad

1.1 32

KauśikaSūtra

2.37 ..... 70 (n. 13)
7.8; 10.1; 11.1; 12.10; 14.1; 18.19; 25.4; 32.28 56
38.17 29
47.1 (comm.) ..... 139, 143 (n. 3)
47.11 ..... (139), 144 (n. 12)
139.10 56
(comm.: end) 148

GoPathaBrāhmaṇa

1.1.6 27

1.2.21; 1.5.10 ..... (138), 144 (n. 10)
1.5.21 33
2.2.6 ..... 70 (n. 12)

ChāndogyOpaniṣad

1.2.12; 3.17.6 34

JaiminīyaBrāhmaṇa

1.357 27

JaiminīyOpaniṣadBrāhmaṇa

2.3.1, 2 34

TāṇḍyaBrāhmaṇa

See under PañcaViṃśaBrāhmaṇa

TaittirīyaBrāhmaṇa

2.1.1.1-3 ..... 62, 64f(f.)
2.4.4.1c 106
3.3.2 68
3.7.4.15 ..... 70 (n. 11)
3.12.9.1 28

TaittirīyaSaṃhitā

1.7.7.2b 105
2.1.5.7; 2.1.7.7; 2.2.8.4, 5; 2.4.11.2, 3 28
3.5.2.1 ..... 31(f.)
4.1.10.3d 107
5.7.3.3 28
7.1.4; 7.5.11.2 34

TaittirīyĀraṇyaka

2.5.2d 107
2.6.2c 106

PañcaViṃśaBrāhmaṇa

8.2.5, 6; 11.8.10 34
12.8.6; 12.9.10; 12.9.18 33
14.3.22 34
16.10.10 33
16.12.1 34
17.1.9, 14, 15 99
17.1.19 100
17.4.1 99
20.11.3 34

Pāṇini

1.1.42, 43 ..... 121 (n. 27)
1.4.61 (: ūryādi-gaṇa 31.27) 107
3.3.105 108
4.2.45 106
6.1.128 107

PāraskaraGṛhyaSūtra

2.5.43 101
3.15.22 109

PaippalādaSaṃhitā

1.1 ..... (56)
1.2.4bc 105
1.6.1a ..... (61)
1.6.1 ..... 57f
1.6 ..... 56f., 59
1.6.1d 61
1.6.2 ..... 58f.
1.6.3 59
1.6.3d 58
1.6.4 ..... 58, 60
1.11.2ab 105
1.16.2cd ..... 105f.
1.18.3c; 1.19.2a, 4ab 106
1.22.3a ..... 106f.
1.27.1d; 1.28.2cd; 1.29.3c 107
1.32.3ab; 1.67.1cd 108
1.68.4cd ..... 108f.
1.80.5a 109

1.86.1-3 ..... 111f.
2.13.1 ..... 91 (n. 12)
2.16.3cd ..... 90 (n. 1)
2.22.5 ..... 93 (n. 52)
2.74.2 ..... 90 (n. 3)
2.74.3, 4, 7 28
3.19.3cd ..... 92 (n. 22)
3.24.3 ..... 46f.
3.25.2 ..... 92 (n. 30)
3.25.7 ..... 93 (n. 39)
4.6.1 96
4.6, 7 29
4.33.5cd ..... 90 (n. 5)
4.38.3 ..... 91 (n. 21)
4.38.4 ..... 92 (n. [21])
4.38.5 ..... 91 (n. 21)
4.38.6 ..... 91f. (n. 21)
4.39.3 ..... 90 (n. 4)
4.39.5 ..... 90 (n. 5)
5.7.1, 5 ..... 94 (n. 64)
5.9.5 ..... 111, 113f.
5.10.3 ..... 46f.
5.16.1 64
5.16 ..... 62f(f.), 66, 69
5.16.2, 3 64
5.16.4 67
5.16.5 ..... 67(f.)
5.16.6-8 68
5.37.2 ..... 49f.
6.3.9 ..... 47(f.)
6.8.8 ..... 48(f.)
6.9.9 49
6.12.3 ..... 52 (n. 13)
6.22.1-9 31
7.4.1 ..... 93 (n. 50)
7.4.2 ..... 93 (n. 51)
7.4.3cd 96
7.4.5, 10a ..... 94 (n. 54)
7.11.4 50
7.12.10 29
7.19.5 50
8.2.1 ..... 95 (n. 69)
8.2.6 126
8.9.10 32
8.12.11 ..... 50(f.)
9.10; 9.10.2cd, 3c, 4cd, 5d, 6d, 7d, 8abd, 10, 12a-f 126
9.17.1 ..... 92 (n. 29)
9.19.1 ..... 92 (n. 28)
9.28.6c 118
10.7.1 ..... 93 (n. 48)
11.8.1-3 ..... 73, 183
11.8 ..... 71, 73, (76)f., 181, 183, 187
11.8.4 ..... 73(f.), 183(f.)
11.8.5-7 ..... 74, 184
11.8.8 ..... 74(f.), 184(f.)
11.8.9, 10 ..... 75, 185
11.9.1; 11.9; 11.9.2 ..... 74, 184
13.1.5 ..... 93 (n. 39)
13.7.13 ..... 94 (n. 67)
16.5.6 140
16.18-20 32
16.24.1 ..... 93 (n. 45), 94 (n. 66)
16.24.5ab ..... 94 (n. 56)
16.24.7 ..... 94 (n. 66)
16.24.9 ..... 92 (n. 23)

16.32.9 ..... 94 (n. 64)
16.32.10ab ..... 95 (n. 79)
16.32.10 ..... 95 (n. 77)
16.33.1[0]cd ..... 95 (n. 79)
16.53-55; 16.55.5; 16.56-58 31
16.59, 60; 16.61.1; 16.61; 16.61.4, 5; 16.62 32
16.63.7 140
16.66-69 32
16.76.1 ..... 92 (n. 26)
16.82-84 32
16.90.9 140
16.97-100; 16.100.2-4 31
16.101-03 32
16.104.1 ..... 92 (n. 24)
16.111.1, 2 28
16.111-13; 16.113.10, 11; 16.114.1; 16.114-17; 16.117.5d 31
16.129.1-10; 16.131.1-10 28
16.133.1-7 31
16.133-35 ..... 31f.
16.139; 16.139.27; 16.140-46; 16.141.1-5 31
17.8.8 32
17.34.2cd ..... 94 (n. 57)
18.4.10; 18.8.5 96
18.15.2 ..... 95 (n. 68)
18.17.5 ..... 95 (n. 71)
18.27 ..... 31, 98
18.27.3 ..... 95 (n. 80)
18.27.4 ..... 95 (nn. 76, 80), 98
18.27.5 ..... 95 (n. 74)
18.27.6 ..... 95 (n. 81), 98
18.27.7 ..... 95 (n. 74)
18.27.8 ..... 31, 95 (n. 75)
18.30.1c-f, 2c-f, 3c-f ..... 90 (n. 4)
19.49.1 ..... 93 (n. 53)
19.49.3 ..... 91 (n. 12)
20.3.6 ..... 91 (n. 13)
20.6.6 96
20.14.9cd ..... 93 (n. 43)
20.25.3; 20.57.1 28

PrayogaBhānu

See under AtharvaVeda-PrayogaBhānu

PrasthānaBheda

(p. 3) 30

BṛhadĀraṇyakOpaniṣad

2.5 33

BrahmaSūtra

2.3.43 32

ManuSmṛti

5.6, 8 ..... 70 (n. 14)

MahāBhāṣya

1.1.4 56
Paspaśāhnika (ṚgVeda 4.58.3) ..... 95 (n. 78)

MānavaGṛhyaSūtra

2.2.19 68

MānavaŚrautaSūtra

1.1.3.25 ..... 70 (n. 11)
1.3.4.3 68

MaitrāyaṇīSaṃhitā

1.11.16 (161.11) 105
2.7.7d (84.3) 107
4.12.1 (179.15) 58

RājaTaraṅgiṇī (of Jonarāja)

(p. 173) ..... 42(f.)

VasiṣṭhaSmṛti

11.54-59 101

VājasaneyiSaṃhitā

9.6b 105
11.80d 107
15.15-19 28
36.24 ..... 144 (n. 9)

VājasaneyiSaṃhitā (Kāṇva)

10.2.3b 105

VaitānaSūtra

14.1 ..... 70 (n. 12)

ŚataPathaBrāhmaṇa

4.1.50.18 33
5.1.4.6b 105
6.6.3.10 (also comm.) 107
6.6.4.3 106
11.5.6.7 34
11.5.8.3 27
11.5.8.7 31
12.6.1.41 32
13.4.3.7, 8 34

ŚāṅkhāyanaBrāhmaṇa

6.11 31
30.6, 9 34

ŚāṅkhāyanaŚrautaSūtra

14.69.1, 2 101

ŚaunakaSaṃhitā

(comm.: introd.) ..... 136, 138, 143 (n. 4), 147
1.1.1a ..... (61)
1.1 ..... 56f., 59
1.1 (comm.) 56
1.1.1 ..... 57(f.)
1.1.2 59
1.1.2d 58
1.1.3a ..... (60)
1.1.3a (comm.), 3c ..... (59)
1.1.3d 58
1.1.4 60
1.4.4b 105
1.6 56
1.9.2a, (also comm.) 4ab 106
1.22.2cd 107
1.23.2cd 106
1.25.2ab (also comm.) 108
1.29.2a 105
1.31.3b (also comm.) ..... 106f.
1.34 (also comm.) 29
2.16 (comm.) 39
2.27.5ab ..... (81f.), 90 (n. 1)
2.28.4a 109
2.33 29
3.3.2 ..... 82, 90 (n. 3)
3.3.3 82
3.3.3-5 28
3.3.3cd ..... 90 (n. 2)
3.8.3c 106
3.14.(1a) 68
3.14.2 ..... 91 (n. 12)
3.15.1 ..... 93 (n. 53)
3.15.6 ..... 91 (n. 12)
3.17.4 ..... 93 (n. 52)
3.18.1 29
3.19.4cd ..... 92 (n. 22)
3.23.4 ..... 90 (n.. 9-10)
4.1 151

4.4.8 ..... 90 (n. 9-10)
4.5.1 96
4.5 29
4.11.1 ..... 90 (n. 9-10)
4.11.2 ..... 90 (n. 9-10), 94 (n. 55)
4.11.4 ..... 92 (n. 30)
4.11.11 ..... 93 (n. 39)
4.15.1-4 ..... 94 (n. 64)
4.23.5cd ..... 90 (n. 5)
4.24 82
4.24.2 ..... 90 (n. 4)
4.24.3 ..... 93 (n. 43)
4.24.5 ..... 90 (n. 5)
4.25.5 ..... 90 (n. 6)
4.29.3, 4 ..... 91 (n. 21)
4.29.5 ..... 92 (n. [21])
4.29.6 ..... 91 (n. 21)
4.34 31
4.36.1b ..... 95 (n. 70)
4.36.1c ..... 95 (n. 69)
5.13; 5.13.1bc, 2bc 126
5.13.3 ..... 95 (n. 69)
5.13.3b-d, 6a, 7ab 126
5.13.7 123
5.13.8, 8d, 9abd, 10c, 11c 126
5.18.1 ..... 92 (n. 29)
5.18.10cd ..... 92 (n. 31)
5.19.4 ..... 92 (n. 28)
5.21.11 ..... 93 (n. 43)
5.21.11cd ..... 93 (n. 40)
5.22.4, 5 ..... 93 (n. 39)
5.22.6 126
5.22.8 ..... 93 (n. 39)
5.23.8c 107
6.34.1 ..... 93 (n. 41)
6.40.1d 107
6.120.3c (also comm.) 106
6.136.1c 108
6.138.3cd (also comm.) ..... 108f.
7.54.1, 2 (56, 57.1) 28
7.58 (60).2 ..... 90 (n. 9-10), 96
7.104 (109).1 ..... 91 (n. 13)
7.110 (115).2cd ..... 93 (nn. 43, 47)
8.2.26 140
8.5.12 ..... 90 (n. 9-10)
8.9 32
8.10 ..... 31f.
9.1.9 ..... 94 (n. 64)
9.1.10 ..... 95 (n. 77)
9.1.20 ..... 95 (n. 79)
9.2.1 ..... 92 (n. 26)
9.4.1 ..... 93 (n. 45), 94 (n. 66)
9.4.2 ..... 90 (n. 9-10)
9.4.3 ..... 92 (n. 25)
9.4.4ab ..... 94 (n. 56)
9.4.4 ..... 90 (n. 9-10), 96
9.4.8 ..... 94 (n. 66)
9.4.9 ..... 92 (n. 23)
9.5; 9.5.22-36; 9.6 31
9.6.1, 2 28
9.6.36-38, 40, 62; 9.7; 9.7.26 31
9.9.10; 10.2; 10.2.20, (22), 23, 25 32
10.3.7 140
10.5.15-21, 25-35 28
10.7.17; 10.8 32
10.10.1 ..... 92 (n. 27)

10.10.(2-6) 87
11.1.22 140
11.2.1 ..... 92 (n. 24)
11.3; 11.3.26 31
11.7 32
11.9.4 ..... 94 (n. 58)
11.9.23 ..... 94 (n. 60)
11.10.4 ..... 91 (n. 19)
11.10.5 ..... 94 (n. 61)
11.10.9 ..... 91 (n. 16)
11.10.10, 11 ..... 91 (n. 17)
11.10.12, 13 ..... 91 (nn. 17f.)
11.10.15 ..... 91 (n. 14)
11.10.16 ..... 91 (n. 20)
11.10.20, 21 ..... 94 (n. 62)
11.10.23 ..... 94 (n. 59)
11.10.27 ..... 91 (n. 15)
12.2.41cd ..... 94 (n. 57)
12.5; 12.5.7-11 31
12.5.12 ..... 127f.
12.5.53 127
13.1.2 ..... 95 (n. 68)
13.1.25 ..... 95 (n. 71)
13.13 56
14.1.43 ..... 91 (n. 11), 96
14.2.14 ..... 90 (n. 9-10), 96
15.1.3 ..... 95 (n. 80)
15.1.4 ..... 95 (nn. 76, 80), 98
15.1.5 ..... 95 (n. 74)
15.1.6 ..... 95 (n. 81), 98
15.1.7 ..... 95 (n. 74)
15.1.8 ..... 31, 95 (n. 75)
15.2.10 ..... 95 (n. 82)
15.2.11 ..... 95 (n. 83)
15.2.12 ..... 95 (n. 84)
15.2.19 ..... 92 (n. 32)
15.2.25 ..... 92 (n. 33)
15.7.4 ..... 92 (n. 35)
15.8.3 ..... 92 (n. 34)
15.10.1, 2 98
15.11, 12; 15.13.1-12 99
15.14.3 ..... 93 (n. 36)
15.14.13, 14 ..... 93 (n. 37)
16.6.4 28
16.24.3 ..... 92 (n. 25)
17.1.1cd, 2cd, 3cd, 4cd, 5cd ..... 90 (n. 4)
18.1.11; 18.3.18 ..... 90 (n. 9-10), 96
18.3.65 96
18.4.58 ..... 90 (n. 9-10), 96
19.9.9 140
19.13.1 ..... 93 (n. 50)
19.13.2 ..... 93 (n. 51)
19.13.3 ..... 90 (n. 9-10)
19.13.3cd 96
19.13.5, 10a ..... 94 (n. 54)
19.27.1 ..... 93 (nn. 47f.)
19.31.8 116
19.36.5 ..... 90 (n. 9-10), 96
19.53.1 ..... 73, 183
19.53 ..... 71, 73, (76)f., 181f., 187
19.53.2, 3 ..... 73, 183
19.53.4 ..... 73(f.), 183(f.)
19.53.5-7 ..... 74, 184
19.53.8 ..... 74(f.), 184(f.)
19.53.9, 10 ..... 75, 185

19.54.1; 19.54; 19.54.2 ..... 74, 184
19.67.1-8 ..... 144 (n. 9)
20.1.1 ..... 94 (n. 54), 96
20.6.6 ..... 94 (n. 54)
20.7.1 ..... 94 (n. 67)
20.12.6 ..... 91 (n. 11), 93 (n. 43), 97
20.17.3 ..... 91 (n. 11), 94 (n. 54), 96
20.17.6 ..... 90 (n. 9-10)
20.17.6b 96
20.17.8 ..... 90 (n. 9-10), 96
20.22.1 ..... 91 (n. 11), 96
20.34.13 ..... 94 (n. 67)
20.36.1 ..... 91 (n. 11)
20.36.1cd 96
20.37.1 ..... 90 (n. 9-10), 96
20.37.6 ..... 90 (n. 9-10), 91 (n. 11), 96
20.37.9c ..... 90 (n. 7)
20.47.1 ..... 91 (n. 11), 97
20.61.3 ..... 94 (n. 65)
20.61.5 ..... 91 (n. 11), 97
20.71.10 ..... 90 (n. 9-10), 96
20.72.1; 20.81.2 ..... 91 (n. 11), 97
20.89.8 ..... 90 (n. 9-10), 96
20.90.1 ..... 95 (n. 72)
20.91.9 ..... 91 (n. 11), 97
20.91.10a ..... 90 (n. 7)
20.91.10 ..... 90 (n. 9-10), 96
20.92.21; 20.94.1, 3 ..... 91 (n. 11)
20.94.3cd 97
20.94.4 ..... 90 (n. 9-10), 96
20.102.1, 3 ..... 91 (n. 11), 97
20.113.2 ..... 93 (n. 42)
20.125.3 97
20.126.15; 20.127.5 ..... 90 (n. 9-10), 96
20.128.4 ..... 90 (n. 8)
20.128.13 ..... 93 (n. 38)
20.137.12 ..... 93 (n. 46)

ŚlokaVārttika

303 ..... 72, 182

ṢaḍViṃśaBrāhmaṇa

4.1.2 (5.1.2) 27

SādhanaMālā

120, 150 129
171, 180, 181, 185 128

SāmaVeda

1.161, 564; 2.81, 964 96

HiraṇyakeśiGṛhyaSūtra

1.13.17 109